

Food Safety and Inspection Service Washington, D.C. 20250

MAY 31 2000

Dr. Romano Marabelli General Director Department of Food and Nutrition and Public Veterinary Health Ministry of Health Piazza Marconi, 20-00144 Rome, Italy

Dear Dr. Marabelli:

This letter transmits the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) final report of a meat inspection system audit conducted in Italy from November 14 through December 19, 2001. No comments on the draft final audit report were received from the Government of Italy.

All deficiencies noted during this audit have been corrected as evidenced by the FSIS audit conducted in April 2002. FSIS appreciates the actions taken by the Government of Italy to resolve the audit deficiencies. Please be advised that all final audit reports are posted on FSIS' website www.fsis.usda.gov/ofo/tsc.

If you have questions or need additional information, you may reach me at 202-720-3781, facsimile at 202-690-4040, or email at sally.stratmoen@fsis.usda.gov.

Sincerely,

/5/Sally Stratmoen, Chief

Equivalence

International Policy Staff

Richard F. Brown

Enclosure

cc:

Lisa Hardy Bass, Counselor, U.S. Embassy, Rome
Ruggero Corrias, Second Secretary, Embassy of Italy, Washington, DC
Mary Revelt, Minister/Counselor for Agric. Affairs, USEU/Brussels
Joerg Niederberger, Agric. EU Mission to the US, Washington, DC
Linda Swacina, Acting Associate Administrator, FSIS
Maritza Colon-Pullano, SAIFS, OPPDE
John Wilson, FAS Area Officer
Robert Macke, FAS
John Prucha, ADA, Program Coordination and Evaluation, OPPDE
Sally Stratmoen, Chief, Equivalence Section, IPS, OPPDE
Karen Stuck, Chief, Import-Export Policy Section, IPS, OPPDE
Donald Smart, Director, Review Staff, OFO
Amy Winton, State Department
Nancy Goodwin, ES, IPS, OPPDE
Country File (Italy—Nov 01 final audit)

FSIS:OPPDE:IPS:ES:N Goodwin:bw:5/30/02:720-9187:5/29/02:Italy-final audit to CVO Apr 02

AUDIT REPORT FOR ITALY NOVEMBER 14 THROUGH DECEMBER 19, 2001

INTRODUCTION

Background

This report reflects information that was obtained during an audit of Italy's meat inspection system from November 14 through December 19, 2001. Forty of the 64 establishments certified to export meat to the United States and that were exporting to the United States were audited. Six of these were slaughter establishments; the other 34 were conducting processing operations. The remaining establishments that are certified to export to the United States were not actively exporting at this time and they were not included in this audit.

The last audit of the Italian meat inspection system was conducted in May 2001. The auditors found significant problems in 10 establishments, which were then designated as marginal/re-review at the next audit. The auditors found sanitation and other conditions to be so serious in eight establishments that these establishments were delisted by the Government of Italy (GOI). In addition, the auditors found that implementation of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) systems was deficient in 22 of 27 establishments audited.

The major concerns from the May 2001 audit were the following:

- 1. The lack of daily inspection coverage in establishments producing products for export to the U.S.
- 2. Inadequate inspection system controls, including the denaturing of condemned or inedible products, enforcement of humane slaughter laws, use of inspection procedures to check for disease, and carcass and offal inspection requirements.
- 3. Instances of actual product contamination and instances of the potential for direct product contamination.
- 4. The lack of monthly supervisory reviews of most certified establishments.
- 5. The continuing problems with the implementation and maintenance of Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOP) in certified establishments.
- 6. The continuing problems with implementation and maintenance of HACCP systems in certified establishments.
- 7. Deficiencies in the *Salmonella* sampling and testing program.
- 8. Deficiencies in Italy's microbiological laboratory testing programs.

Italy exports only processed pork products to the United States. Fresh pork may not be exported due to the presence of hog cholera and swine fever in Italy. From January 1 to

September 30, 2001, Italian establishments exported 3,593,523 pounds of pork products to the United States. Port-of-entry rejections were for unsound condition (0.02%), miscellaneous defects (0.05%), and missing shipping marks (0.05%).

PROTOCOL

This on-site audit was conducted in four parts. One part involved visits with Italian national meat inspection officials to discuss oversight programs and practices, including enforcement activities. The second part involved on-site visits to 40 establishments: 34 processing establishments (5L, 23L, 25L, 41L, 90L, 151L, 160L, 172L, 205L, 316L, 335L, 363L, 368L, 442L, 476L, 480L, 492L, 500L, 513L, 514L, 550L, 586L, 632L, 649L, 683L, 688L, 714L, 720L, 744L, 758L, 989L, 1170L, 1217L, and 1223L) and six slaughter establishments (92M/S, 272M/S, 304M/S, 312M/S, 643M/S, and 791M/S). All six of Italy's certified slaughterhouses and another seven processing establishments were selected for audit because of serious concerns arising from the previous on-site audits. Twenty-seven additional establishments were selected randomly from certified establishments actively exporting to the United States. The third part involved visits to nine government laboratories, all of which culture field samples for the presence of generic *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) and *Salmonella*. Two of the nine laboratories also perform analytical testing of field samples for the national residue-testing program. The fourth part involved visits to six regional inspection offices and four local inspection offices.

Program effectiveness determinations focused on five areas of risk: (1) sanitation controls, including the implementation and operation of Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOP), (2) animal disease controls, (3) residue controls, (4) slaughter/processing controls, including the implementation and operation of HACCP systems and the generic *E. coli* testing program, and (5) enforcement controls, including the testing program for *Salmonella*. Italy's inspection system was assessed by evaluating these five risk areas.

During all on-site establishment visits, the auditors evaluated the nature, extent, and degree to which findings impacted on food safety and public health, as well as overall program delivery. The auditors also determined if establishment and inspection system controls were in place.

To gain an accurate overview of the effectiveness of inspection controls, FSIS requested that the audits of the individual establishments be led by the inspection officials who normally conduct the monthly reviews for compliance with U.S. specifications. A Ministry of Health (MOH) official requested that FSIS lead this current audit and FSIS agreed. In the future, MOH officials will lead the audits of the individual establishments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Summary

Forty establishments were audited. The auditors found sanitation and other conditions to be so serious in four establishments that the establishments were delisted by the GOI (160L, 363L, 500L, and 989L). The auditors found serious problems in five establishments. These establishments were designated as marginal/re-review during the next audit (172L, 492L, 649L, 744L, and 758L).

Six Regional Inspection Offices and four local inspection offices were visited. The seventh Regional Office declined the visit citing other commitments. The following six Regional Offices were visited: Lombardia, Lazio, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Guilia, Toscana, and Marche. Four local inspection offices were visited, one each within the following regions: Lombardia, Lazio, Emilia-Romagna, and Toscana.

As stated above, numerous major concerns had been identified during the May 2001 audit of the Italian meat inspection system. During this current audit, the auditors determined that no significant improvements were made by the GOI since the May 2001 audit. Some improvements were noted in individual establishments' implementation and operation of HACCP and SSOP. These improvements may be attributed to a working group formed by the MOH after the May 2001 audit to address the May 2001 audit findings or to training provided through Italian trade associations directly to establishment personnel. Despite the improvements noted, the Italian meat inspection system still has major deficiencies, which demonstrate a lack of government oversight as evidenced by the findings presented in this report.

Details of audit findings, including compliance with HACCP, SSOPs, and testing programs for *Salmonella* species and generic *E. coli*, are discussed later in this report. Data collection instruments for SSOP, HACCP, and testing programs for generic *E. coli* and *Salmonella* can be found in Attachments A, B, C and D respectively. Individual establishment reports can be found in Attachment F.

Entrance Meetings

On November 14, 2001, an entrance meeting was held at the Ministry of Health in Rome. The Italian government participants were Dr. Silvio Borrello, Dipartimento Alimenti Nutrizione E Sanita' Pubblica Veterinaria (DANSPV), Dirigente II Livello- Direttore Ufficio VIII; Dr. Pietro Noe, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello-Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Piergiuseppe Facelli, Veterinario Dirigente II Livello, Direttore Ufficio III, DANSPV; Dr. Angelo Di Donato, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Pinto Ornella, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Alessandro Cascone, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Lidia Cecio, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Lidia Cecio, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII, DANSPV; Dr. Raffaella Augelli, Veterinario Coadiutore Ufficio VIII, and Ms. Marina Paluzzi, Interpreter.

The United States government participants were Dr. Faizur R. Choudry, International Audit Staff Officer, Technical Service Center (TSC), Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS); Dr. Oto Urban, International Audit Staff Officer, TSC, FSIS; Ms. Ann Murphy, Agricultural Attaché, United States Embassy, Rome; and Mr. Sandro Perini, Agricultural Specialist, United States Embassy, Rome.

Topics of discussion at the first entrance meeting included the following:

- ♦ Welcome by Dr. Silvio Borrello, Dirigente II Livello, and explanation of the Italian meat inspection system.
- Discussion of the previous audit report.
- The audit itinerary and travel arrangements.
- ♦ Training programs for veterinary meat inspection officials for pathogen reduction and other food safety initiatives such as SSOP, HACCP programs, generic *E. coli* testing and *Salmonella* testing.
- ♦ The auditors provided (a) a copy of the current Quarterly Regulatory and Enforcement Report, (b) FSIS Directive 6420.1, Livestock Post-mortem Inspection Activities-Enforcing the Zero Tolerances for Fecal Material, Ingesta, and Milk, and (c) FSIS Notice 22-01, Procedures for FSIS Personnel during Pre-implementation Period for "Retained Water in Raw Meat and Poultry Products; Poultry Chilling Requirements."

On November 26, 2001, a second entrance meeting was held at the Ministry of Health in Rome. The Italian government participants were Dr. Silvio Borrello, Dipartimento Alimenti Nutrizione E Sanita' Pubblica Veterinaria (DANSPV), Dirigente II Livello- Direttore Ufficio VIII and Dr. Piergiuseppe Facelli, Veterinario Dirigente II Livello, Direttore Ufficio III, DANSPV. The United States government participants were Dr. Ghias Mughal, Branch Chief, International Review Staff, FSIS, and Mr. Franco Regini, Agricultural Specialist, Foreign Agricultural Service, United States Embassy, Rome.

Topics of discussion at the second entrance meeting included the following:

- ♦ Welcome by Dr. Silvio Borrello, Dirigente II Livello, and explanation of the Italian meat inspection system.
- Discussion of the previous audit report.
- ♦ The audit itinerary and travel arrangements.

Government Oversight and Responsibility

FSIS regulations require that foreign countries that request eligibility to export meat to the United States or to maintain their current eligibility be organized and administered by the national government. More specifically, the National government must have an inspection system consisting of an organizational structure with staffing to ensure uniform enforcement of the requisite laws and regulations in all establishments producing product for export to the United States. Second, the national government must have ultimate control and supervision over the official inspection activities of all employees and licensees. Third, the national

government must ensure the assignment of competent, qualified inspectors. Fourth, national inspection officials must have the authority and responsibility to enforce the laws and regulations governing meat inspection, and fifth, the country must have adequate administrative and technical support to operate its inspection program.

Our auditors noted the following.

1. Organizational Structure and Staffing

The Italian meat inspection system is organized in three levels. The first level consists of the Ministry of Health, which includes Veterinary Services. It is this level of government that FSIS holds responsible for ensuring that FSIS requirements are implemented and enforced. The second level consists of Regional Offices. There are 21 Regional Offices (19 regions and two provinces). Each Regional Office is autonomous and independent from the MOH. Among Regional Offices, there are differences in organization, staffing and available resources. Within each Regional Office, a third level exists known as the Aziende Sanitarrie Locali (ASL), which are also autonomous. The ASLs provide the inspectors for actual inspection activities.

There are generally two levels of employment of inspectors and veterinarians at the ASLs and the Regional Offices. These two levels consist of a Director of the ASL or Region and staff veterinarians. Each level appears to be independent of the other. If a veterinarian assigned to the establishment fails to properly discharge his/her responsibilities, the Director seems to have little or no authority to take proper disciplinary action. The auditor was told that if such a situation arises, the MOH will decertify the establishment and the establishment may then sue the veterinarian to recover the damages.

All inspection veterinarians and inspectors in establishments certified by Italy as eligible to export meat products to the United States were MOH regional and local government employees, receiving no direct remuneration from either industry or establishment personnel.

The MOH has responsibilities for participating and negotiating new or revised inspection legislation, interpreting and clarifying inspection-related European Commission Directives, United States requirements and Italian laws and regulations, and transmitting these documents to the Regional Offices. Although compliance is requested by the MOH, each Regional Office and ASL may create their own corresponding circulars, forms, and instructions, provided they meet the minimum requirements outlined by the MOH.

Although an organizational structure is in place for headquarters, the Regional Offices, and the ASLs, staffing at the MOH and the Regional Offices appears inadequate. As stated above, Regional Offices vary in staffing and available resources. It appears that this inhibits the ability of the inspection officials to enforce European Commission Directives and U.S. inspection requirements.

2. Ultimate Control and Supervision

On November 6, 2001, the MOH sent a circular to all Regional Offices requesting that they develop inspection procedures as described in the circular and to adopt procedures and forms for inspection that meet the provisions in the circular. However, since the circular was only issued one week before our auditors arrived in Italy, the Regional Offices had not had time to implement the circular. In one Regional Office, the circular could not be located.

The supervision and authority delegated by each Regional Office and ASL varies. Our auditor found that government inspectors and veterinarians that work at the establishments are generally not accountable to the ASL, the Regional Office, or the MOH. The inspectors that actually perform the routine inspection activities are hired and paid by the ASL. The ASL or the Regional Office generally cannot discipline or fire poor performing employees but can only recommend action to the Director General of the ASL against such an employee.

Although detailed instructions are issued by the MOH for the Regions and the ASLs on requirements to be carried out by Regions or ASLs, including on-site visits to establishments, the MOH and the ASLs seems to rely heavily upon the results of FSIS audits of individual establishments rather than meeting the MOH's requirements. Italy's inspection system appears to be reactive for maintaining compliance rather than preventive. For example, the MOH verified compliance with U.S. requirements only in the slaughter establishments found unacceptable during the May 2001 audit. The MOH did not conduct any other verification activities with regard to determining compliance of processing establishments that were found to be unacceptable or marginal/re-review.

There appears to be no regular or uniform verification procedure by the MOH of the circulars sent to the Regional Offices and ASLs to assure that the circulars have been implemented. For example, two microbiology directors indicated their willingness and ability to perform analyses according to U.S. methodology. However, both also said that they had not been instructed by the MOH to implement U.S. methodology and would not change their procedures until requested to do so by the MOH.

3. Assignment of Competent, Qualified Inspectors

In 29 processing establishments, the GOI was not providing daily inspection coverage. Inspectors were visiting establishments at variable frequencies such as two to three times a week, once a week, twice a month, or once a month. In four of the regions audited, the auditor was told that there were not enough inspection resources to provide daily inspection coverage.

Once inspectors are assigned, the GOI does not have a uniform method to prioritize and assign inspection tasks. The performance of inspection tasks at an establishment is solely dependent upon the judgment of the inspector.

In all 40 of the establishments audited, the GOI inspectors were not aware of deficiencies until pointed out to them by the auditors. In addition, in nine of the 40 establishments GOI inspectors did not take corrective actions when deficiencies were discovered.

The auditor noted that all government veterinarians must have completed at least three years of specialized training in food inspection prior to hiring. Additionally, some Regional Offices have provided opportunities for formal training in HACCP and other food science disciplines. However, considerable training in basic sanitation principles and FSIS' Pathogen Reduction requirements is still needed. This need for additional training is evidenced by the fact that the majority of establishments continue to have serious problems with basic sanitation, which has resulted in direct product contamination and the potential for direct product contamination. In addition, the auditor found that most inspectors and veterinarians assigned to certified establishments do not understand how to implement or have not been required to implement FSIS' Pathogen Reduction requirements, which include SSOP, HACCP, generic *E. coli* testing, and *Salmonella* testing.

The auditor was advised that there is no supervision of inspectors and veterinarians in the Regional Offices and the ASLs. The auditor was told that all government veterinarians are expected to operate at a high level of professionalism and trust. The performance of these veterinarians is rarely questioned. Actual visits to determine competence by the Regional Office are not routinely performed or documented and are not part of any written supervisory plan.

4. Authority and Responsibility to Enforce the Laws

Prior to our May 2001 audit, ASLs had the responsibility for approving establishments for export to the U.S. and to withdraw such approval for cause. Subsequent to our May 2001 audit, the MOH assumed this responsibility. Under the direction of the MOH, any new establishment that wishes to export to the U.S. has 90 days to comply with U.S. requirements. The ASL monitors the establishment and then notifies the MOH, either through the Regional Office or directly, of the decision to certify or not certify the establishment for U.S. export. The MOH generally does not visit these establishments onsite but will certify the establishment based on the ASL's recommendation.

For example, an establishment in the Lazio Region, which had been delisted by the GOI at FSIS' recommendation during the May 2001 audit, was recertified prior to our November 2001 audit without verification of its acceptability by the MOH. This establishment had not undertaken any corrective actions since the last audit and was again found unacceptable by FSIS during this new audit. An establishment in the Marhe Region was certified by the MOH but was delisted just prior to the start of the current audit. When asked about the situation, the auditor was told that the establishment was decertified because the Regional Office had found some problems in the establishment that were not known to MOH at the time of certification. The MOH has advised that in the future it will verify the acceptability of all new establishments by conducting on-site visits to the establishments before they are certified for export.

The only change in the organizational structure or upper levels of the MOH was the hiring of five new staff officers (3 full time and 2 part time) subsequent to the May 2001 audit. This brings the total headquarters staff to six employees. The auditor was told that once training had been completed for these new employees, the MOH would be able to conduct monthly supervisory reviews of the U.S. certified establishments to verify the implementation of FSIS requirements.

5. Adequate Administrative and Technical Support

The auditors were concerned over the inability of the MOH to provide basic resources for the FSIS audit, which resulted in industry personnel transporting the auditors to the establishments. The allocation of appropriate resources to support a third party audit still remains.

Establishment Audits

Establishment Operations by Establishment Number

The following operations were being conducted in the 40 establishments visited on-site:

Pork slaughter and boning - six establishments (92M/S, 272M/S, 304M/S, 312M/S, 643M/S, and 791M/S)

Pork de-boning and prosciutto/cooked hams – 34 establishments (5L, 23L, 25L, 41L, 90L, 151L, 160L, 172L, 205L, 316L, 335L, 363L, 368L, 442L, 476L, 480L, 492L, 500L, 513L, 514L, 550L, 586L, 632L, 649L, 683L, 688L, 714L, 720L, 744L, 758L, 989L, 1170L, 1217L, and 1223L)

Forty establishments were visited. Four establishments (160L, 363L, 500L, and 989L) were found to be unacceptable because of critical sanitation problems, findings of direct product contamination, and noncompliance with basic HACCP requirements and were delisted by the GOI. Five establishments (172L, 492L, 649L, 744L, and 758L) were rated marginal/rereview because of deficiencies regarding sanitation, condition of facilities, and noncompliance with HACCP requirements.

Laboratory Audits

During the laboratory audits, emphasis was placed on the application of procedures and standards that were equivalent to U.S. requirements. Information about the following risk areas was also collected:

- 1. Government oversight of accredited, approved laboratories.
- 2. Intra-laboratory quality assurance procedures, including sample handling.
- 3. Methodology.

The Instituti Zooproficlattici Sperimentali Laboratories in Torino and Brescia were audited on December 12 and 13, 2001, respectively. Both of these laboratories perform analytical testing of field samples for the national residue control program. Effective controls were in place for sample handling and frequency, timely analysis, data reporting, tissue matrices for analysis, equipment operation and printouts, minimum detection levels, and proficiency testing. The methods used for the analyses were acceptable. No compositing of samples was done. More detailed information on audit findings can be found under "Residue Controls" further in this document.

Italy's microbiological testing for *Salmonella* was being performed in government Instituti Zooproficlattici Sperimentali (IZS) laboratories. Nine of these laboratories were visited. The nine included the residue laboratories in Torino and Brescia as they also perform microbiological testing. Eight of these nine laboratories perform analyses for the GOI on product intended for export to the United States.

Italy has advised FSIS that it adopted all FSIS requirements except the following equivalent measures: The government laboratories use ISO 6579 and AOAC 967.25 methods to analyze samples for *Salmonella*. During the May 2001 audit, FSIS found that laboratories were using modified analytical methods that had not been sent to FSIS for an equivalence determination.

More detailed information on audit findings can be found under "Slaughter/Processing Controls" and "Enforcement Controls" further in this document.

SANITATION CONTROLS

As stated earlier, the auditor focuses on five areas of risk when assessing a foreign country's inspection system. The first of these risk areas that the auditor reviews is Sanitation Controls. These controls include the implementation and operation of SSOP programs in certified establishments, all aspects of facility and equipment sanitation, actual or potential instances of product cross-contamination, personal hygiene and practices, and product handling and storage.

Based on the on-site audits of establishments, Italy's inspection system had controls in place for water potability records; chlorination procedures; back-siphonage prevention; separation of operations; temperature control; work space; ventilation; ante-mortem facilities; welfare facilities; and outside premises.

In the following areas, inspection system controls were not adequate:

Sanitation Standard Operating Procedure (SSOP)

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for SSOP were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment A).

The SSOP in the 40 establishments were found to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements, with the following deficiencies.

- ♦ In 31 establishments, GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring or verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The inspectors were performing pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP with variable frequencies, such as once a week, twice a month, once a month and four times a year. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*
- ♦ In 12 establishments, the records for SSOP operational sanitation and any corrective action taken were not being maintained. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*
- ♦ In three establishments, the written SSOP procedure did not address pre-operational sanitation. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*
- ♦ In three establishments, the written SSOP did not address operational sanitation. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*
- ♦ In two establishments, the SSOP procedure did not identify the individual responsible for implementing and maintaining the activities. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*

<u>Cross-Contamination</u>: In the area of cross-contamination, actual product contamination and the potential for product contamination was found in 26 out of 40 establishments audited.

Examples of findings of <u>actual</u> product contamination include:

- ◆ In nine establishments, insanitary equipment was directly contacting edible product in the processing rooms, fresh product receiving rooms, and cold boning rooms. For example, working tables and frames of tables, containers for edible product, meat grinding equipment, band saw, conveyor belt for edible product, brine injection equipment, racks, and molds for hams were found with flaking paint, rust, fat, pieces of meat, grease, and dirt from the previous days' operation. In some establishments, the conveyor belt for edible product was cracked and deteriorated in the salting rooms and product receiving room. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In five of nine establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- ♦ In nine establishments, exposed edible-product was contacting an unclean fork lift, inedible product containers, posts, dirty legs of racks for edible product that stacked on top of each other, unclean protective covering for air circulation system, walls and doors during handling and transportation in the de-boning rooms, ham salting rooms, ham curing rooms, and fresh ham receiving rooms. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In four of nine establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- In three establishments, dripping condensate from overhead refrigeration units, ceilings, rails, pipes, and beams that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, was falling onto exposed edible product in the cooler, fresh product receiving room, corridors, defrosting room,

cooking room, and smoking rooms. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In two of three establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.

- ♦ In three establishments, sanitizers were not maintained at the required temperature (82°C) in the boning rooms. In one other establishment, the sanitizer was not in operation during processing operations. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In two of three establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ In one establishment, water was falling onto hog carcasses from the carcass splitting saw at the carcass splitting station. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. This is a repeat deficiency for this establishment.

Examples of findings of <u>potential</u> cross-contamination of product include:

♦ In six establishments, overhead ceilings in the processing rooms and ham salting rooms were observed with an accumulation of pieces of fat, meat, flaking paint, and dirt. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In one of six establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.

<u>Personal Hygiene and Practices</u>: In the area of personal hygiene and practices, the following deficiencies were noted.

◆ In eight establishments, several employees were observed picking up pieces of meat from the floor, handling unclean inedible product containers, a fork lift, and trash containers and, without washing their hands, handling edible product. establishments, plastic packaging materials, cartons, and strings for hanging hams were contacting the floor and inedible product containers in the packaging rooms. establishment, a few employees were not using hygienic work habits. For example, paper towels were kept another establishment, edible product was not unpacked in a sanitary manner to prevent

June 1964.

exposed product contamination. In another establishment, street clothes and working clothes were not kept separate in the locker. This is a n Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964.

Product Handling and Storage

deficiencies were noted.

♦ In 11 establishments, edible product that contacted the floor (dropped meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product. The f for reconditioning dropped meat was inadequate. There was no designated area with light, no written proper procedure, and no hand washing or sanitizing facilities. This is a

noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *In one of 11 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*

- In 11 establishments, edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination or cross utilization in the boning room, ham slicing room, and ham salting rooms, and processing rooms. *In two of 11 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- In eight establishments, pest control prevention was inadequate. For example, in one establishment, the dry storage room for packaging materials had no front and side walls (plastic curtains) to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Mice droppings, urine, cobwebs, dirt and debris were observed and packaging materials were not stored on racks high enough and away from walls to monitor pest control and sanitation programs. Evidence of rodent infestation was observed on several dates in the personnel office and welfare rooms by a private pest control company during their routine monitoring program. Rodenticides were replaced in the bait boxes but no other effort was made to take corrective or preventive measures either by the pest control company, establishment personnel, or by the GOI meat inspection officials. In another establishment, the door in the product receiving room was not effectively shut. The vent in the smoking room was broken and flies were observed in the processing and packaging rooms. In five establishments, gaps at the bottoms and sides of doors in the boning rooms, casing rooms, product receiving rooms, emergency doors leading to the processing rooms, and dry storage rooms were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. In one other establishment, cobwebs were observed in the ham curing room. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. In one of eight establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.

<u>Establishment Facilities</u>: In the area of maintenance of establishment facilities, the following deficiencies were noted.

- In four establishments, light was inadequate and not shadow proof at the hog head, viscera and carcass inspection stations in the slaughter room. *In two out of four establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ◆ In one establishment, walls and covings were broken in numerous places in the coolers and processing rooms. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964.

ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROLS

The second of the five risk areas that the auditor reviews is Animal Disease Controls. These controls include ensuring adequate animal identification, control over condemned and restricted product, and procedures for sanitary handling of returned and reconditioned product. Except as noted below, Italy's inspection system had adequate controls in place.

There were reported to have been no outbreaks of animal diseases with public health

approximately 100,000 bovine were tested for Bovine Sponigiform Encephalopathy and 30 were found positive. Italy is prohibited from exporting beef to the U.S. In addition, Italy is not free from Hog Cholera or Swine Vesicular Disease. Although Italy is currently free of

border with a country that is not free of Foot and Mouth Disease.

The following deficiencies were noted.

In two out of six slaughter establishments, the mandibular lymph nodes of hog heads

lymph nodes and spleen were not palpated during post mortem inspection. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*

• In all 40 establishments, inedible product was not denatured or de-characterized or placed under security before shipping for rendering. In one establishment, inedible product was kept in open containers outside the premises. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*

RESIDUE CONTROLS

The third of the five risk areas that the auditor reviews is Residue Controls. These controls include sample handling and frequency, timely analysis, data reporting, tissue matrices for analysis, equipment operation and printouts, minimum detection levels, recovery frequency, percent recoveries, and corrective actions.

The Instituti Zooproficlattici Sperimentali (IZS) Laboratories in Torino and Brescia were audited on December 12 and 13, 2001, respectively.

The following deficiencies were noted.

- ◆ The standards book for chlorinated hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, trace elements, hormones, sulfonamides, chloramphenicol, and ivermectin was not properly maintained for the quality assurance program. For example, when the analyst prepares the solutions, the standards book was not signed and verified by the supervisor before the solutions were used. Corrections to the standards book were not made by means of a single line through the incorrect entry with the correct information written above or after the error.
- ♦ When percent recovery results fell below the established acceptable range limit for chlorinated hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), hormones, arsenic, and chloramphenicol, no corrective actions were taken or documented for the quality

assurance program. This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit with regard to percent recovery for PCBs.

◆ The check sample program did not meet FSIS or EU requirements. In most sections of the laboratories, regular spiked samples that are routinely run as part of a sample set were erroneously considered to be check samples. No intra-laboratory and/or inter-laboratory check samples for the quality assurance program were performed for chlorinated hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, trace elements, hormones, sulfonamides, chloramphenicol, antibiotics, and ivermectin except for one inter-laboratory check sample (ring test) was performed for polychlorinated biphenyls and trace elements in 2001. This is a noncompliance with Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996.

The auditors found that Italy's National Residue Testing Plan for 2001 was being followed and was on schedule. The GOI had adequate controls in place to ensure compliance with sampling and reporting procedures and storage and use of chemicals. The methods used for the analyses were acceptable.

SLAUGHTER/PROCESSING CONTROLS

The fourth of the five risk areas that the auditor reviews is Slaughter/Processing Controls. The controls include the following areas: adequate animal identification; ante-mortem inspection procedures; ante-mortem disposition; humane slaughter; post-mortem inspection procedures; post-mortem disposition; ingredients identification; control of restricted ingredients; formulations; processing schedules; equipment and records; and processing controls of cured, dried, and cooked products. The controls also include the implementation of HACCP systems in all establishments and implementation of a generic *E. coli* testing program in slaughter establishments. Deficiencies are discussed below.

♦ In one out of six slaughter establishments, hogs were not stunned in such a manner that they would be rendered unconscious with a minimum excitement and discomfort such as a few hogs were observed staggering and crawling on the top of other stunned hogs and their throats were slit by the employee without any further stunning. This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.

<u>HACCP Implementation</u>: All establishments approved to export meat products to the U.S. are required to have developed and implemented a HACCP system. Each of these systems was evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment B).

The HACCP programs were reviewed during the on-site audits of the 40 establishments. The auditors found the following deviations from FSIS' regulatory requirements.

◆ In 14 establishments, the HACCP plan was not validated to determine if it was functioning as intended. *In six of 14 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.

- ♦ In 20 establishments, the HACCP plan did not state adequately the procedures that the establishment would use to verify that the plan was being effectively implemented and the frequencies with which these procedures would be performed. The ongoing verification activities of the HACCP program were not performed adequately either by the establishment personnel or by the GOI meat inspection officials. *In 10 of 20 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- ♦ In 13 establishments, the HACCP plan did not address adequately the corrective actions to be followed in response to deviations from critical limits. *In six of 13 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ In 12 establishments, the hazard analysis was not adequately conducted. *In one of 12 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ In 12 establishments, the HACCP plan did not adequately specify critical limits for each CCP and the frequency with which these procedures would be performed. *In four of 12 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- In six establishments, the HACCP plan flow chart did not adequately describe the process steps and product flow.
- ♦ In six establishments, the HACCP plan's record keeping system was not adequately documenting the monitoring of CCPs. *In two of six establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- In three establishments, there was no adequate written HACCP plan for each product where the hazard analysis revealed one or more food safety hazard(s) reasonably likely to occur. *In one of three establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ◆ In four establishments, the HACCP plan did not address the intended use of or the consumers of the finished product(s). *In one of four establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.
- ◆ In three establishments, the final review of all documentation associated with the production of the product prior to shipping was not done. *In one of three establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*

Testing for Generic E. coli

Italy has adopted the FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing. Six of the 40 establishments audited were required to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing. These six establishments were evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment C).

The following deficiencies were noted.

- ◆ In three establishments, the carcass selection was not made randomly and use of a random method of selection was not specified in the procedure. *In three of three establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ In two establishments, the sequence of carcass sponging was not being followed properly. *In two of two establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ In one establishment, the procedure did not designate the employee(s) responsible for collecting the samples.

ENFORCEMENT CONTROLS

The fifth of the five risk areas that the auditor reviews is Enforcement Controls. These controls include the enforcement of inspection requirements and the testing program for *Salmonella* species.

Except as noted in this report, the GOI had controls in place for ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection procedures and dispositions; restricted product and inspection samples; disposition of dead, dying, diseased or disabled animals; shipment security, including shipment between establishments; and prevention of commingling of product intended for export to the U.S. with product intended for the domestic market.

In addition, controls were in place for the importation of only eligible livestock from other countries, i.e., only from eligible third countries and certified establishments within those countries, and the importation of only eligible meat products from other counties for further processing. Adequate controls were found to be in place for security items, shipment security, and products entering the establishments from outside sources.

Testing for Salmonella Species

Prior to this audit Italy had advised FSIS that it had adopted all of the FSIS requirements for *Salmonella* species testing with the sole exception of the use of different analytic methods. FSIS had determined that Italy's use of the ISO 6579 and AOAC 967.25 methods were equivalent to FSIS' requirements.

Six of the establishments audited were required to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* testing, and were evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment D).

The following deficiencies were noted.

♦ In all six slaughter establishments, *Salmonella* samples were collected by the establishment personnel under the direct supervision of government employees. The only

scenario currently approved by FSIS for Italy is the use of government employees to collect samples. *In six of six establishments, this is a repeat deficiency*.

- In two establishments, the samples were not being taken randomly.
- ♦ In two establishments, the sequence of carcass sponging was not being followed properly. *In two of two establishments, this is a repeat deficiency.*
- ♦ Microbiology methods in-use tended to be based on standard methods. However, some laboratories are modifying standard methods and are not strictly adhering to standard protocols. Modifications to standard methods are not acceptable. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*

Species Verification Testing

At the time of this audit, Italy was required to test product for species verification. Species verification testing was not being conducted in eight establishments (5L, 41L, 92M/S, 160L, 205L, 335L, 363L, and 989L). Species testing is required in any establishment that is approved to ship product to the U.S. This testing is required on products that are not readily identifiable as to source (i.e., any product that does not consist of a whole, intact muscle such as cooked sausage product or chopped and formed ham product).

Listeria monocytogenes Testing

Establishments producing ready-to-eat products are required to reassess their HACCP plans to determine if *Listeria monocytogenes* should be considered as a hazard reasonably likely to occur. All 34 processing establishments that were reviewed on-site produce ready-to-eat products and had not amended their HACCP plans to include *Listeria monocytogenes* as a hazard reasonably likely to occur.

Monthly Reviews

The internal review program was applied equally to both export and non-export establishments. Internal review visits were both announced and not announced in advance, and were conducted, at times by individuals and at other times by a team of reviewers. These reviews were being performed by the regional or local officials, and were all veterinarians. The records of audited establishments were kept in the inspection offices of the individual establishments, and copies were also kept in the regional and provincial offices.

In some establishments, only two or three reviews are conducted each year instead of monthly as required by FSIS. However, as stated earlier, the MOH has pledged to acquire the staff and resources to begin conducting monthly reviews of all certified establishments.

<u>Inspection System Controls</u>

The following deficiencies were noted.

- ♦ In eight establishments, periodic supervisory visits were not performed monthly. Only two to four internal reviews were conducted per year by the local officials and/or by the veterinarian assigned to different establishments in the same area. *This is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.*
- In 11 establishments, edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination/cross-utilization in the boning room, ham-slicing rooms, ham salting rooms, and processing rooms. In two of 11 establishments, this is a repeat deficiency from the May 2001 audit.
- ♦ In two establishments, incorrect labels were used. For example, in one establishment a statement on the label of Leonardo Ham declares that the hams used are from Italy, when the hams were actually imported from Denmark. In another establishment, the label approval indicates the European Union number instead of one approved for the U.S.

Exit Meeting

The exit meeting was conducted at the Ministry of Health in Rome, on December 19, 2001. The participants from Italy were Dr. Silvio Borrello, Dirigente II Livello- Direttore Ufficio VIII, Department of Food Nutrizion and Public Veterinary Health (DANSPV); Dr. Pietro Noe, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello-Ufficio VIII; Dr. Angelo Di Donato, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio III; Dr. Alessandra Di Sandro, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII; Dr. Alessandro Cascone, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII; Dr. Lidia Cecio, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII; Dr. Raffaella Augelli, Veterinario Coadiutore Ufficio VIII; Dr. Ornella Pinto, Veterinario Dirigente I Livello, Ufficio VIII; Dr. Pierantoni Marco, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Emilia Romagna; Dr. Duratti Giuseppe, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia; Dr. Sigismondi Mariano, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Lazio; Dr. Giorgioni Adriano, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Lazio; Dr. Clare Norman, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Lazio; Dr. Filippo Castoldi, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Lombardia; Dr. Guglielmo D' Aurizio, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Marche; Dr. Baronti Omelio, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Toscana; Dr. Riccardo Galesso, Assessorato Alla Sanita, Regione Veneto; Dr. Migrelli Arrigo, Istituto Zooprofilattico Della Lombardia E Dell' Emilia; Dr. Silvamo Moca, Istituto Zooprofilattico Dell' Umbria E Delle Marche; Dr. Decastelli Lucia, Istituto Zooprofilattico Del Piemonte Della Liguria E Della Valle D' Aosta and Ms. Marina Paluzzi, Interpreter.

The United States government participants were Dr. Faizur R. Choudry, International Audit Staff Officer, TSC, FSIS; Dr. Oto Urban, International Audit Staff Officer, TSC, FSIS;

Dr. Ghias Mughal, Branch Chief, International Review Staff, FSIS; Ms. Ann Murphy, Agricultural Attaché, United States Embassy, Rome, and Mr. Franco Regini, Agricultural Specialist, Foreign Agricultural Service, United States Embassy, Rome.

The auditor explained to the GOI inspection officials that their inspection system was audited in accordance with the European Union/United States Veterinary Equivalence Agreement (Agreement). The auditors audited the meat inspection system against European Commission Directives, specifically (1) Council Directive 64/433/EEC of June 1964, (2) Council Directive 96/23/EC of April 29, 1996, and (3) Council Directive 96/22/EC of April 29, 1996. These three directives have been declared equivalent under the Agreement. In areas not covered by these directives, such as the requirement for daily inspection in processing establishments, the requirement for humane handling and slaughter of animals, the handling and disposal of inedible and condemned materials, and the requirement for species verification testing, the auditors audited against FSIS requirements and equivalence determinations, including the Pathogen Reduction/HACCP requirements. These requirements include regulations on HACCP, SSOP, and *E. coli* and *Salmonella* testing.

The following topics were discussed:

- 1. The lack of daily inspection coverage in establishments producing products for export to the U.S.
- 2. Inadequate inspection system controls, including the denaturing of condemned or inedible products, enforcement of humane slaughter laws, use of inspection procedures to check for disease, and carcass and offal inspection requirements.
- 3. Instances of actual product contamination and instances of the potential for direct product contamination.
- 4. The lack of monthly supervisory reviews of most certified establishments.
- 5. The continuing problems with the implementation and maintenance of SSOP in certified establishments.
- 6. The continuing problems with implementation and maintenance of HACCP systems in certified establishments.
- 7. Deficiencies in the *Salmonella* sampling and testing program.
- 8. Deficiencies in Italy's microbiological laboratory testing programs.
- 9. The lack of testing for species verification.
- 10. Deficiencies in the Instituti Zooproficlattici Sperimentali residue laboratories in Torino and Brescia concerning the laboratories' quality assurance programs.
- 11. The supervisory structure above the level of official veterinarian in the establishment is weak at best.

Ministry of Health officials stated that they would take the necessary steps to ensure that corrective actions and preventive measures are taken to address the noted deficiencies.

CONCLUSION

The Italian meat inspection system has major deficiencies, which demonstrate a lack of government oversight as evidenced by the findings presented in the report. However, a few improvements were observed in individual establishments' HACCP and SSOP programs.

The auditors found sanitation and other conditions to be so serious in four establishments that the establishments were delisted by the GOI. The auditors found significant problems in five establishments, which were then designated as marginal/re-review.

The GOI meat inspection officials stated that they would ensure prompt compliance. However, these assurances have been given previously at the conclusion of the May 2001 and September 2000 audits yet few, if any, corrective actions have been taken to date.

Dr. Faizur R. Choudry International Audit Staff Officer (signed)Dr. Faizur R. Choudry

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Data Collection Instrument for SSOP
- B. Data Collection Instrument for HACCP Programs
- C. Data Collection Instrument for Generic *E. coli* testing.
- D. Data Collection Instrument for Salmonella Testing
- E. Laboratory Audit Forms
- F. Individual Foreign Establishment Audit Forms
- G. Written Foreign Country's Response to the Draft Final Audit Report (*no comments received*)

Data Collection Instrument for SSOP

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for SSOP were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument contained the following statements:

- 1. The establishment has a written SSOP program.
- 2. The procedure addresses pre-operational sanitation.
- 3. The procedure addresses operational sanitation.
- 4. The pre-operational procedures address (at a minimum) the cleaning of food-contact surfaces of facilities, equipment, and utensils.
- 5. The procedure indicates the frequency of the tasks.
- 6. The procedure identifies the individuals responsible for implementing and maintaining the activities.
- 7. The records of these procedures and any corrective action taken are being maintained on a daily basis.
- 8. The procedure is dated and signed by the person with overall on-site authority.

The results of these evaluations were as follows: (see next page)

	1.Written	2. Pre-op	3. Oper.	4. Contact	5. Fre-	6. Respons-	7. Docu-	8. Dated
	program	sanitation	sanitation	surfaces	quency	ible indiv.	mentation	and signed
Est. #	addressed	addressed	addressed	addressed	addressed	Identified	done daily	,
5-L	V	V	V	V	\ \ \	V	V	V
23-L	√ /	V	V	V	√ ,	V	√ /	√ /
25-L	√	V	V	1	V	V	V	V
41-L	√ ,	V	V	√ ,	√ /	√ /	no	V
90-L	√ /	V	V	V	√ ,	√ /	no	V
92 M/S	√ /	V	V	V	√ ,	√ /	√ /	√ /
151-L	√ /	V	V	V	V	V	√ /	V
160-L	V	V	V	V	√ 	V	V	V
172-L	√	no	V	√	√	V	no	V
205-L	√,	V	V	√	√	V	V	V
272 M/S	V	V	√	√	√	V	V	V
304 M/S	√	V	V	√	√	V	V	V
312 M/S	V	V	V	√	√	V	V	V
316-L	V	V	V	√	√	V	V	V
335-L	√	V	$\sqrt{}$	√	√	V	V	V
363-L	√	no	no	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
368-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	
442-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	
476-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$
480-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$
492-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$		no	$\sqrt{}$
500-L	\checkmark	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$
513-L	\checkmark	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
514-L	\checkmark	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
550-L	$\sqrt{}$	V		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	V
586-L	$\sqrt{}$	V		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	V
632-L	$\sqrt{}$	V	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	V		$\sqrt{}$
643 M/S	$\sqrt{}$		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	\checkmark			$\sqrt{}$
649-L	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	\checkmark	$\sqrt{}$	no	$\sqrt{}$
683-L	$\sqrt{}$	V		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	V	no	V
688-L	V	V	V	$\sqrt{}$	√	V	V	V
714-L	$\sqrt{}$	V		$\sqrt{}$	√	V	$\sqrt{}$	V
720-L	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	$\sqrt{}$	√	no	$\sqrt{}$	V
744-L	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	$\sqrt{}$	√	V	no	V
758-L	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	V	V	V
791 M/S	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
989-L	V	V	no	V	V	no	no	V
1170-L	V	V	V	V	V	V	no	V
1217-L	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
1223-L	V	V	V	1	V	V	V	V

Data Collection Instrument for HACCP Programs

Each of the establishments approved to export meat products to the U.S. was required to have developed and implemented a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) system. Each of these systems was evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument included the following statements:

- 1. The establishment has a flow chart that describes the process steps and product flow.
- 2. The establishment has conducted a hazard analysis that includes food safety hazards likely to occur.
- 3. The analysis includes the intended use of or the consumers of the finished product(s).
- 4. There is a written HACCP plan for each product where the hazard analysis revealed one or more food safety hazard(s) reasonably likely to occur.
- 5. All hazards identified in the analysis are included in the HACCP plan; the plan lists a CCP for each food safety hazard identified.
- 6. The HACCP plan specifies critical limits, monitoring procedures, and the monitoring frequency performed for each CCP.
- 7. The plan describes corrective actions taken when a critical limit is exceeded.
- 8. The HACCP plan was validated using multiple monitoring results.
- 9. The HACCP plan lists the establishment's procedures to verify that the plan is being effectively implemented and functioning and the frequency for these procedures.
- 10. The HACCP plan's record-keeping system documents the monitoring of CCPs and/or includes records with actual values and observations.
- 11. The HACCP plan is dated and signed by a responsible establishment official.
- 12. The establishment is performing routine pre-shipment document reviews.

The results of these evaluations were as follows: (see next page)

Est.#	1. Flow diagram	2. Haz- ard an- alysis conduct	3. Use & users includ- ed	4. Plan for each hazard	5. CCPs for all hazards	6. Mon- itoring is spec- ified	7. Corr. Actions are des- cribed	8. Plan valida- ted	9. Adequate verific. proced-	10.Ade- quate docu- menta-	11. Dat- ed and signed	12.Pre- shipmt. doc. review
<i>5</i> 1		-ed							ures	tion		
5-l	no	√ .	√	√	√	no	√	√	√ .	no	√	√
23-1	V	√	√	√	√	√	no	√	√	√	√	√
25-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
41-1	V	no	√	√	√	no	√	√	no	√	√	√
90-1	√	√	no	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
92ms	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	no	no	√	√	√
151-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
160-l	$\sqrt{}$	√	√	√	√	no	no	no	no	no	√	no
172-1	no	no	√	√	V	no	no	no	no	no	√	√
205-1	$\sqrt{}$	√	√	\checkmark	V	√	√	no	no	\checkmark	√	√
272ms	\checkmark	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	no	√	√	√
304ms	V	√	√	√	√	√	no	no	no	√	√	√
312ms	no	no	√	√	√	no	no	√	no	√	√	√
316-l	V	V	√	√	V	√	√	V	√	√	√	√
335-1	no	√	√	√	V	no	√	no	no	√	√	√
363-l	V	no	√	no	V	no	√	no	no	√	√	no
368-1	√	√	√	√	V	no	no	√	no	√	√	√
442-1	√	no	√	√	V	√	no	no	no	no	√	√
476-l	√	no	√	√	V	√	√	√	√	√	√	V
480-1	√	no	√	√	V	√	no	V	no	√	√	√
492-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
500-1	no	no	no	√	√	no	no	no	no	no	√	√
513-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
514-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
550-1	√	no	√	no	√	√	√	no	√	√	√	√
586-l	no	no	√	√	√	√	√	√	no	√	√	√
632-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
643ms	√	√	√	√	√	no	no	no	no	√	√	√
649-1		√	√	√	√	no	no	√	√	√	√	√
683-1	√ √	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
688-l		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
714-1	√	√ √	√	√	√ √	√	√	√	√ √	√	√	1
720-1	√	no	√	√ √	√ √	√	√ √	no	no	√	√	√
744-1	√	√	no	√ √	√ √	√	no	√	√	√ √	√ √	√ √
758-1	√	√ √	√	√ √	√	√	√	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √
791ms		√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√	√	no	no	√ √	√ √	√ √
989-1	√	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	√ √	no
1170-1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√ √	√
1217-1	√	√	√	√ √	√	√	√	√ √		√	√	√ √
1223-1	<u>√</u>	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	√ √	no √	√	√ √	\ √

Data Collection Instrument for Generic E. coli Testing

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument contained the following statements:

- 1. The establishment has a written procedure for testing for generic *E. coli*.
- 2. The procedure designates the employee(s) responsible to collect the samples.
- 3. The procedure designates the establishment location for sample collecting.
- 4. The sample collection is done on the predominant species being slaughtered.
- 5. The sampling is done at the frequency specified in the procedure.
- 6. The proper carcass site(s) and/or collection methodology (sponge or excision) is being used for sampling.
- 7. The carcass selection is following the random method specified in the procedure or is being taken randomly.
- 8. The laboratory is analyzing the sample using an AOAC Official Method or an equivalent method.
- 9. The results of the tests are being recorded on a process control chart showing the most recent test results.
- 10. The test results are being maintained for at least 12 months.

	1.Writ-	2. Samp-	3.Samp-	4. Pre-	5. Samp-	6. Pro-	7. Samp-	8. Using	9. Chart	10. Re-
	ten pro-	ler des-	ling lo-	domin.	ling at	per site	ling is	AOAC	or graph	sults are
Est. #	cedure	ignated	cation	species	the req'd	or	random	method	of	kept at
			given	sampled	freq.	method			results	least 1 yr
92 ms	$\sqrt{}$				$\sqrt{}$			$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
272ms					\checkmark	no	no			$\sqrt{}$
304 ms					\checkmark	no	no		$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
312 ms					\checkmark				$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
643ms	V	no					no			
791 ms	√	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V

6. Sequence for hog carcass sample site was belly, ham, jowl instead of ham, belly, jowl.

Data Collection Instrument for Salmonella Testing

Each slaughter establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* testing were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument included the following statements:

- 1. Salmonella testing is being done in this establishment.
- 2. Carcasses are being sampled.
- 3. Ground product is being sampled.
- 4. The samples are being taken randomly.
- 5. The proper carcass site(s) and/or collection of proper product (carcass or ground) is being used for sampling.
- 6. Establishments in violation are not being allowed to continue operations.

The results of these evaluations were as follows:

	1. Testing	2. Carcasses	3. Ground	4. Samples	5. Proper site	6. Violative
Est. #	as required	are sampled	product is	are taken	and/or	est's stop
			sampled	randomly	proper prod.	operations
92 M/S	V	V	N/A	V	V	$\sqrt{}$
272 M/S	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	N/A	no	no	$\sqrt{}$
304 M/S	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	N/A	no	no	$\sqrt{}$
312 M/S	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	N/A	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$
643 M/S	V	V	N/A	V	V	V
791 M/S	V	V	N/A	V	V	V

5. Sequence for hog carcass sample site was belly, ham, jowl instead of ham, belly, jowl.

NOTE: Establishment personnel were collecting the samples under the direct supervision of GOI inspection officials.

Attachment E NAME OF FOHEIGH LABORATOR REVIEW DATE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUATURE FOOD EAPLY AND INEPECTION ECRVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS ISTITUTI Zooprefilattico 11/29/01 FOREIGN COUNTRY LABORATORY REVIEW CITY & COUNTRY ADDRESS OF LABORATORY FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY Umbria - Marche 60000 ANCONA ANCONA, Italy via Cupa di Posatoro REGION NAME OF REVIEWER NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL DR. Donattela Ottaviani Ghias Mughal Residue Code/Name FLEVIEW ITEMS ITEM # OK Sample Handling 01 SANYUNG PROCEDURES 02 Sampling Frequency NA OK Timely Analyses 03 Compositing Procedure 04 NA 06 Interpret Comp Date OK Data Reporting 90 ok aHached Comments Acceptable Method 07 ALIAL TITICAL PROCEDURES Correct Tlesue(s) 80 NA 80 Equipment Operation 09 Ok Instrument Printouts 10 ok Minimum Detection Levele 11 NA Recovery Frequency 12 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES NA Percent Recovery 13 NA Check Sample Frequency 14 OK All analyst w/Check Samples 16 OK Corrective Actions 16 OK. International Chack Samples 17 OK CODE Corrected Prior Deficiencies 18 EVAL EVAL 88 19

EYAL.

DATE

Devented well-mark on being see

20

FSIS FORM 8820-4 (9/90)

SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER

Laboratory: Istituti Zooprofilattico, Ancona

Address: Sezione Diagnostiche

60100 ANCONA

Via Cupa di Posatora, Italy

Date of Visit: 11/29/01

Reviewer: Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Donatella Ottaviani, Director, Food Microbiology

Findings: There was no US approved slaughter plant in the Region, however, there was an approved processing plant at the time of the visit. Samples from this plant are analyzed at this laboratory. All samples are given to the analyst are anonymous, therefore the analyst is unaware of the origin of the sample. Director said that laboratory will request the ASL to mark US samples in future and will use ISO methods for analysis of these samples.

Methodology used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use a modification of ISO 11290-1 method, reference ISS procedure and ISTITAN 96/3. This is a repeat finding

Salmonella: Not strictly adhering to any single standard method, although reference ISO 6579, Italian Law and site the FDA Bacteriological Analytical Manual (BAM) verbally. ISO method used is modified and is certified by AFNOR. They run an immunoassay screen "FOSS EIA" that is AOAC-performance based.

This is a repeat finding.

Generic E. coli: Use Biomerieux"Coli-ID" mrthod which has been validated by AFNOR. This is a repeat finding.

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs. They will soon start this check sample program. This is a repeat finding

*****************	U.O. DEPARTMENT OF A	AICULTURE					1			IEIGN LABORATORY							
	Parini oha yyaka door Ortlangiini					1/1	11/30/01 /5+			Istituto Superioredi Sanita (13 Viale Regia Elena 299 DOMESS OF LABORATORY SAGREST							à (135)
F	RATORY REVIEW					Via			ale	e Regia Elena 299						• /	
FOREIGN	GOV'T AGENCY		CITY	& C	TOUNTE	IY +	taly OD161			ESS OF	LABOR	KTORY	1/: 5	110 41			
La	Zio Region		K	01	me_	LZ	2/5		001	61,	Rom	و	Vee ارارا Octo	do na 14 112683 Isra: Prof	e - for Me Can inc	COELETTES	201
	F REVIEWEN		NAM	6 0	f FORE	GN OFF	TAISE			· -		۸	ÇL.	•		obiole	
DR	· Ghias Mugha	K		\mathcal{I}	DR.	Pai	010	Αι	erel	i. D	ired	5	FOOD	m	ICr	obiole	99 Y
	Residue Cod		, >	-									1			1	
	REVIEW (TEMS	1	TEM #	\sqcap									1		l — —	1	
	Sample Hendling		01		OK]	İ			
DUMESS	Sampling Frequency		02	ODE	NA												
PROCE	Τιποίγ Απάγεθε		03	D XCI	OK												
BANTUHA PROCEDURES	Compositing Procedure		04	EVALUA	NA									<u> </u>	!	<u> </u>	
SAR	Interpret Comp Data		06	ğ	oK.								<u> </u>				
**********	Data Raporting		06		OK												
w	Acceptable Method		07	SQE E	U- =	5	ee '	out	tach	ed	Cov	ma	nts				
ALIALYTHCAL PROCEDURES	Correct Tlasue(s)		08	ONOL	NA.						<u> </u>		:				
Proc	Equipment Operation		09	EVALUATION	OK			ļ			ļ	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	
***	Instrument Printouts		10	ũ	OK												
	Minimum Detection Lev	pic	11		NA						1	{ ·					•
#4 C)	Recovery Frequency		12		NA					<u> </u>		İ			ļ — —		
SSURANCE SURER	Percent Recovery		13	18	NA			1	-		1	Ì					
ASS ED C	Check Sample Frequence	ev l	14	ĕ		5	00	att	66		Com	mer	its				
QUALITY AS PROCEDI	All analyst w/Check 6a	mples	16	ALUATIC	OK			1		Ť	1					1	
à	Corrective Actions		16	12	OK:			1	 								
	International Check Sar	nples	17	1	OK			 	 	 	1-	 					
REVIEW	Corrected Prior Deficien	clos	18	EVAL CODE													
OTHER REVEN			19	88										e-uni ento			
Res			20	EVAL.												7	
ANGIZ	TURE OF REVIEWER									•	DATE			·			
-	philipping and a second a second and a second a second and a second and a second and a second and a second an																
FSIS FO	DRM 8820-4 (9/3CI	1											90	e 6USQ eu	יים אנו או אפיי	PIPIN: 1CB N	

Laboratory: Istituto Superioredi Sanita (ISS)

Address: Viale Regia Elena 299

00161, Rome, Italy

Date of Visit: 11/30/01

Reviewer: Dr.Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Paolo Aureli, Director, Food Microbiology

This institute serves as an authority and reference laboratory for all other Istituti Zooprofilattici. It is the technical and scientific body of the Italian National Health Service for matters relating public health and is responsible for public health research experiments, and training.

ISS does not test product samples from any US approved plants.

Methodology used:

Salmonella: Use National Italian method UNI EN 12824

Generic E. Coli: Use National Italian Method U59132360 (MPN method using modified laurel-sulfate tryptose broth with MUG)

Listeria monocytogenes: Use ISO method# 11290-1

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

NAME OF FOHEIGH LABORATORY REVIEW DATE U.O. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUATURE Istituto Zooprofilattico Via Castelpulci FOOD EXPERY AND INSPECTION BERVICE
THE WAY THE THE PROGRAMS 12/3/01 FOREIGN COUNTRY LABORATORY REVIEW ADDRESS OF LABORATORY CITY & COUNTRY FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY 50010 SanMartino alla Palma Florence, ttaly VESCOLINO, 108 TO CHIESEST - FEX EMETITO DIFFERMON PROF, CANCING CORT BLEZZI OLDS Lazio-Tostana Regions NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL NAME OF REVIEWED DR. Paolo Marloni DR. Ghias Mughal Residue Code/Name ITEM # REVIEW ITEMS OK 01 Sample Handling BANYLING PROCEDURES 02 NA Sampling Frequency OK 03 Timely Analyses NÀ 04 Compositing Procedure OK **Q**5 Interpret Comp Deta OK 06 Data Reporting Comments attached :UL 07 Acceptable Method ALM THCAL PXOCEDURES 60 NA Correct Tlesue(s) OK 09 Equipment Operation ok 10 Instrument Printouts Minimum Detection Levele 11 NA NA 12 Recovery Frequency OUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES 8 NA 13 Percent Recovery ALUATION Se 14 Check Sample Frequency Ok 16 All analyst w/Check Samples ak: Corrective Actions 16 International Chack Samples 17 ON CODE Corrected Prior Deficiencies 18 EVAL. 88 19 EYAL. 20 SISTANCE OF REVIEWER DATE Des post en "acarina Bathweig FSIS FORM 8820-4 (9/9C)

Laboratory:

Istituto Zooprofilattico

Address:

Via Castelpulci

50010 Sanmartino allaPalma

Florence, Italy

Date of Visit:

12/3/01

Reviewer:

Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Paola Marconi, Director, Food Microbiology

There is no US approved slaughter house in the area. However, there are some processed product establishments near by. Laboratory is not aware if samples are from US certified plants. Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL and have one external audit annually.

Methodology used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use a modification of ISO method # 11290-1. This was a repeat finding.

Previously they were using ISO method # 6579 which has been Salmonella: modified. Laboratory conserves agar plates by streaking secondary enrichment to only one half of the agar plate, rather than using a whole plate for each secondary enrichment broth culture. Appears to have been corrected.

Generic E. Coli: Use Biomeriux "Coli ID" method which has been validated by AFNOR.

Use of Control Organisms: There has been improvement in this area since last audit. They have started using control organisms with some batches. Also, improvement was observed in the check sample program.

u.s. department of agriculture food eapery and indepetition expuce butternational programm								Aic Ini	Istituto Zooprofilattico Sede Centrale OGIO Perugia ADDRESS OF LABORATORY SUPERIOR										
F	DREIGN COUNTRY LABO	RATO	RY RE	VIE	:W	1	2/4/	0]	0610 Perugia										
FOREIGN GOVT AGENCY Umbria-Marche Region			Peri			Perugia Italy V					Via G. Salvemini					Socio Carriale, 10: 54 TO THO VECKO, IND. 148 IN. 51 1196851 - FBA 2487770 Differen Prof. CAN TWO CORT ELLEX			
	F REVIEWEN		41444	<u> </u>	C CAREIG	N AEI	DICTAL		,			<u></u>	(ALE	3					
DR	Ghias Mughal		1	2	Q. M	10C	a	511	vand	$o_{\mu}U$	ires	0/	Que	tlery	7	i'ro			
	Residue Cod	eMan	16	-									! 1	! !					
	REVIEW MEMS		ITEM #										[1				
	Sample Handling		01		OK						ļ					<u> </u>			
DURES	Sampling Frequency		02	181	NA														
валяшна гросерияея	Timely Analyses		0З	O XCL	OK									<u> </u>		<u> </u>			
እጭሀማር	Compositing Procedure		04	YALUA	NA						<u> </u>		! ! !	!	 	<u>i</u>			
Q &	Interpret Comp Date		06		OK						 		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
**********	Data Reporting		06		OK	********													
. 1.65	Acceptable Method		07	07 9 09 09 10 EVALUATION CODE	U	,	Se	20	tta	ehe	9 (om n	cat	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
AULTHCAL PROCEDURES	Correct Tlesue(s)		60										•						
AFIAL	Equipment Operation		09		ou					- <u></u>									
-	Instrument Printouts		10		OK.														
	Minimum Detection Lev	ple	11		NA		<u> </u>			L		<u> </u>		<u> </u>					
assurance Houres	Recovery Frequency		12		NA									<u> </u>					
3	Percent Recovery		13	18	NA									İ	1				
2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Check Sample Frequence	97	14	S S	36 9	S	e	at	tach	ed	Com	mec	ts			<u></u>			
QUALITY A	All analyst w/Check 6a	mples	16	Y ON	or														
8	Correctivo Actions		16]6	ok:										T				
	International Check Sac	ples	17		OK.				1						1				
REVTEW	Corrected Prior Deficier	clas	18	EVAL CODE											4.00				
OTHER REVEW			19	8									:						
Q #			20	EVA!												•			
ANGIZ	TURE OF REVIEWER			1	<u>. </u>				<u></u>	1	DATE	<u>.</u>	<u></u>	1	J				
FSIS FO	DRM 8820-4 (9/9C)	i		_			~~~				<u> </u>			M 6∪4 8:	n *acarfu	PIPIN: ICB W			

Laboratory: Istituto Zooprofilattico, Perugia

Address: Sede Centrale

0610 Perugia

Via G. Salvemini, Perugia Italy

Date of Visit: 12/4/01

Reviewer: Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Moca Silvano, Director, Quality Control

There is no US approved slaughter house in the area. However, there are some processed products establishments near by. Laboratory processes samples from US certified plants. Laboratory.

Accreditation: SINAL, have one external audit annually.

Methodology used: Testing procedures for Listeria monocytogenes, salmonella, and generic E. coli is similar to the Institute in Ancona.

Listeria monocytogenes: Use a modification of ISO method # 11290-1 in combination with a VIDAS ELISA screening test.

Salmonella: Using ISO method # 6579 in combination with VIDAS ELISA screening test. This method has an AFNOR validation, however, it is not used at FSIS laboratories.

Generic E. Coli: Use Biomeriux "Coli ID" method which has been validated by AFNOR.

All of the above are repeat findings. Director of Quality Control Program indicated that he has no problem using methods acceptable to FSIS but he needs instructions from the Ministry of Health to do so.

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

	U.O. Department of Agricalty The Hortpertment on a that a goog	rke Mice			REV	VIEW DA	TE	NAME	OF FOF	EBAL SZ	ABORAT	ORY ORY	eatt	1.	H 4631 8644
FC	emandali and the second of the	DRY RE	VIE	ew		12/5	lol	Via	E	Die	oopr ena	16			
FOREIGN	GOV'T AGENCY	Tarr	40	OUNTR	,1			ADDR	SS OF	LABOR	ATORY	Sect	Corrain.		
ombo	ardia - Romagna Regions FREVIEWEN	M	od	lena	It	alf		4112	א טפ	rode	na	Ve= 54	CATOTA 521,00,00 15832111) - FB< 2487.	7/0 7/0
NAME O	F REVIEWEN	MARK	50	C FORFIC	N OF	MCIAI					·	OLA		J 111 . NY 1	JOHN RUEZ
DR.	Ghias Mughal	1	DA	2. <i>S</i> 1	tef	ano	8	assi	D	iredi	or 	~~~~		r	
	Residue Code/Nat	ne 🕨	-												
	REVIEW ITEMS	ITEM #		24	,,										
	Sample Handling	01		OK						ļ					ļ
DUSES	Sampling Frequency	02	CODE	NA						<u> </u>					
PROCE	Timely Analyses	03	NOL	oK											<u> </u>
валяшна г р осерияея	Compositing Procedure	04	EVALUA	NA	·										
SAR	Interpret Comp Deta	Q6		ac											
	Data Reporting	06		OK											
.1.16	Accoptable Method	07	CODE	U		See	A	Ha	che	4	Com	med	1		
THCA	Correct Tlesue(s)	60	Ž	N				ļ	<u> </u>			:			
AUNITHCAL PROCEDURES	Equipment Operation	09	FVAILUAT	or	~~~			<u> </u>	<u> </u>						
•	Instrument Printouts	10	2	OK											
	Minimum Detection Levels	11		NA				1			1.				
S	Recovery Frequency	12	یا	NA		<u> </u>					<u> </u>				
32	Percent Recovery	13	- 16 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	NA							1		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES	Check Sample Frequency	14	OLEVIA 14.	u		<u>ee</u>	al	tad	feel	Co	mme	uto		<u> </u>	
Ę,	All analyst w/Check Sample	16		ou							<u> </u>				
8	Corrective Actions	16		OK		<u> </u>									
	International Check Samples	17		OK		1									
RENTEW PROCEDURES	Corrected Prior Deficiencies	18	3000	ביאת כיטונ											
OTHER REVEW		19	130									:			
ot Rev		20		EVAL						1		•			•
ANGIZ	ATURE OF REVIEWER			.1	·	<u></u>	.1	1	.1	DAT	€	 -	J.,	1	
	ORM 8820-4 (9/9C)									<u> </u>			PE 42-pt-4-ct-	oc.Rflin	

Laboratory: Istituto Zooprofilattico, Modena

Address: Via E. Diena 16

41100 Modena, Italy

Date of Visit: 12/5/01

Reviewer: Dr.Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Stefano Bassi, Director.

Receives samples from US approved slaughter and processing plants. Samples are brought to the laboratory by employees of ASL in automobiles, are coded in the receiving area and sent to the technician as anonymous samples. This is normal procedure in all of the Italian government laboratories.

Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL in May 2001.

Methodology used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use an internally done modification of ISO method # 11290-1.

Salmonella: Using ISO method # 6579 which has been internally modified.

Generic E. Coli: Previously were using a modification of AOAC-ISO method # 991-14. Seems to have recently started using this ISO method without modification.

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

F :0	U.O. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICUA FOOD EAFLTY AND INDEFECTION : INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM	ervice 11		C141		2/7/		NAME 157	of for	to z	ABORA Zoof	TORY B	lat	tic	ð . S.
FOREIGN	GOV'T AGENCY Clia Regions	Long	4. (COLINT	<u>~</u> 1_			ADDR	FSS DE	LABOR	ATORY				
NAME O	Gheas Mughal	NAM	E O	F FORE	IGN OF	PICIAL	Ros	46	li:	Dire	tor	- 856 - G	eu e	ral	(Dei a
	Residue Code/N		-					1							7
	REVIEW (TEMS	ITEM #						1				 			-
	Sample Handling	01		ok											
DURES	Sampling Frequency	02	ODE	NA.											
PROCE	Timely Analyses	03	ONCE	OK	ļ										<u> </u>
валяшна гросерияея	Compositing Procedure	04	VEC.	NA								!			i
BANS	Interpret Comp Data	06	E E	oK											
	Data Reporting	06		OK											
	Accoptable Method	07	300	u		Se	e	AU	eci	ed	Co	mme	uto		
ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES	Correct Tlesue(s)	09	S	NA				<u> </u>				:			
AFLAL. PROCE	Equipment Operation	09	TAULY	OK											
	Instrument Printouts	10	12	ok				1							
	Minimum Detection Levels	11	T	NA							•				
20	Recovery Frequency	12	يا	NA				1							
SURANCE VPREB	Percent Recovery	13	18	NA											
	Check Sample Frequency	14				Se	e	At	tac	hed	C	mm	uts		
QUALITY ASS PROCEDI	All analyst w/Check Sampl	es 15	VAUATIO					T							
8	Corrective Actions	16]2	OK											
	International Chack Sample	17		ok											
REVIEW PROCEDURES	Corrected Prior Deficiencie	s 18	EVAL CODE												
OTHER REVEW		19	35.									:	t-united		:
REV		20	Š									•			
ANGIZ	TURE OF REVIEWER	1	<u>.i_</u>	1	i	1	l	_1	1	DATE	<u></u>	<u>:</u>			

Laboratory:

Address:

Istituto Zooprofilattico, Montova Strada Circonvallazione Sud 21/A

46100 Montova, Italy

Date of Visit: 12/7/01

Reviewer:

Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. Carlo Rosignoli, Director General.

Receives samples from US approved slaughter and processing plants. Samples are brought to the laboratory by employees of ASL in automobiles, are coded in the receiving area and sent to the technician as anonymous samples. This is normal procedure in all of the Italian government laboratories.

Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL.

Methodology used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use an internally done modification of ISO method # 11290-1.

Salmonella: Using ISO method # 6579 which has been internally modified.

Generic E. Coli: Use a modification of AOAC-ISO method # 991-14. Have recently started using this ISO method without modification.

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

Istituto Zooprofilattico sede Centrale 10154 Torino FOOD EAFLYY AND IMPECTION ECRNICE FOREIGN COUNTRY LABORATORY REVIEW CITY & COUNTRY ADDRESS OF LABORATORY FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY Social Contracts, 10:54TOTNO Italy Via Bologna 148 (C. STOTED VECTOR OF THE CONTROLL OF THE Torino Italy Piemonte- Liguria VEROL IN 148 10. CHIECEST - FOR METTIO DISSUAD PROLICENT WE CORT ELLESSE OLDS Region NAME OF REVIEWER NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL DR. Gheas mughal Rasidue Code/Name FLEVIEW (YEMS ITEM # OK 01 Sample Handling SANGURA PROCEDURES NA 02 Sampling Frequency OK Timely Analyses 03 NA Compositing Procedure 04 ok 06 Interprat Comp Data 06 OK Data Reporting attach Commea See et Acceptable Method 07 ACIAL TTICAL PACCEDURES Correct Tlasue(s) 80 NA **Equipment Operation** 09 OK Instrument Printouts 10 Minimum Detection Levels 11 NA Recovery Frequency 12 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES NA Percent Recovery 13 NA Attoched Check Sample Frequency 14 u All analyst wiCheck Samples 16 OL Corrective Actions 16 oK International Chack Samples 17 OK. CODE 18 Corrected Prior Deficiencies EVAL. 88 19 OTHER REVEW EYAL. 20 SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER DATE FSIS FORM 8820-4 (9/9C) PRINTICE WITH NO CE PING 19C

REVIEW DATE

U.O. DEFARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NAME OF FOHEIGH LABORATORY

Laboratory:

Istituto Zooprofilattico, Torino

Address:

Sede Centrale 10154 Torino.

Via Bologna 148, Italy

Date of Visit:

12/12/01

Reviewer:

Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dr. S. Andrvetto, Director General.

Receives samples from US approved slaughter and processing plants. Samples are brought to the laboratory by employees of ASL in automobiles, are coded in the receiving area and sent to the technician as anonymous samples. This is normal procedure in all of the Italian government laboratories.

Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL.

Methodology Used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use AFNOR method V08-055 which appears to be similar to ISO method # 11290-1.

Salmonella: Using AFNOR method V08-052 which appears to be similar ISO method # 6579. Also use a ELISA VIDAS screening method.

Generic E. Coli: Use a draft ISO method which will become a standard Italian method (Italian UNI) in 2002.

Director of the laboratoryindicated that she has no problem using methods acceptable to FSIS but he needs instructions from the Ministry of Health to do so.

Use of Control Organisms. Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

FOREIGN COUP FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY Lombardia Melia Romagha NAME OF REVIEWER DR. Ghias R HEVIEW TEMS Sample Hunco Sample Hunco Sample Hunco Compositing Interprat Con Data Reports Accoptable Correct Ties Equipment C Instrument I	Regions Tughal Hasidue Cod Siling Equency Yees Frecedura Imp Data Imp Mathod Sue(a)	RATO	NAM NAM 01 02 03 04 06 06 07	SVALUATION COOK	of FOI	REIGN	ــــــ	ta det	ol ly Eti	Via E z	ede 51 MESS A	Cay Coff.	anci	raliant T	Ve:	Servaire ato Fro to, no. 1: c: 15:88: data, Prot	al	into
FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY OM DAY dia - melia Romagha NAME OF REVIEWER DIL Ghias IT FREVIEW ITEMS Sample Hand Sampling Free Timely Analy Compositing Interprat Cor Data Reports Acceptable I Correct Tles Equipment C Instrument I	Regions Tughal Hasidue Cod Siling Equency Yees Frecedura Imp Data Imp Mathod Sue(a)	,	01 02 03 04 06 06 07	SVALUATION COOK	of FOI	REIGN	ــــــ		ly Ei	Via Ez	SI/NESS	OF L	ABORA	ni 7	Social So	Corresponding Control of the Control	-Fisc 341 CAN TH	COET
Minimum De	Regions Tughal Taghal	NAM 01 02 03 04 06 06 07	EVALUATION CODE	of FOI	REIGN	Loc	ta	ly Ei	E z	A.	E	Pired	hi7	Section 10 to 10 t	Control of the contro	al	# CDET	
FIEVIEW TEMS Sample Hand Sample Hand Sample Hand Compositing Interprat Compositing Interprat Compositing Correct Ties Equipment Composition Instrument in	nughal hasidue Cod diing equency yees Freedure mp Data ling Mathod cue(s)		01 02 03 04 06 07	EVALUATION CODE	Ol Ni Ol	4	Loc	icial de C	Ei	Ez	10	E -	Pired	ctor	G	enev	al	
FIEVIEW ITEMS Sample Hand Sampling Free Timely Analy Compositing Interprat Cor Data Report Acceptable I Correct Ties Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	Assidue Cod diling equency yees Frocedure mp Data ling Mathod cue(s)	maNe	01 02 03 04 06 07	EVALUATION CODE	Ol Ni Ol	4		dec								enev 	ax I	
Sample Hence Sample Hence Sampling Free Timely Analy Compositing Interpret Con Data Report Acceptable I Correct Tles Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	dling equency yees Procedure mp Data ling Mathod sue(s)	e/Nam	01 02 03 04 06 06	EVALUATION CODE	NI NI OI	4												
Sample Hand Sampling Free Timely Analy Compositing Interprat Cor Data Report Acceptable I Correct Ties Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	equency yees Procedure mp Date ling Mathod sue(s)		01 02 03 04 06 06	EVALUATION CODE	NI NI OI	4												
Data Report Acceptable I Correct Yes Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	Procedure mp Data Ing Mathod sue(s)		03 04 06 06 07	FVALUATION CO	NI OI	4												
Data Report Acceptable I Correct Yes Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	Procedure mp Data ling Mathod sue(s)		04 05 06 07	FVALUATI	N	4					-	_						
Data Report Acceptable Correct Yes Equipment C Instrument Minimum De	mp Data Ing Marhod		06 06 07	73	O	× -					1	- 1				<u>!</u>		
Data Report Acceptable I Correct Yes Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	Ing Mathod we(s)		06 0 7		-	1				` 	1_				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	i
Acceptable I Acceptable I Correct Yles Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	Mathod sue(s)		07		OK	,									<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Correct Tles Equipment C Instrument I Minimum De	ue(s)			1.		-			-							-	Mem em	
Instrument (18	U	1	1	Se	e	AC	ke	sch	ed	Co	an 41	ats	1	
Instrument (1		80	12	5 . 1	A									:		ļ	<u> </u>
Minimum De	Operation		09		o o	<u>.</u>												<u> </u>
	Printouts		10		Ol	وا												<u> </u>
Recovery Fr	etection Lev	alc	11		N	4					1_			•		<u> </u>		<u></u> .
Percent Rec	ednouch		12		"N	A												
To 64	κονετγ		13	78	B N	4					7	\neg						T
Check Samp	ple Frequenc	Y	14		<u> </u>	-		Sec	₽ .	AH	, b.	1	1	Cor	me	15	1	1
Check Samp Check Samp All analyst v Corrective A	w/Check 6a	nples	16		U O	W					\top	\exists						1
Corrective A	Actions		16	أ	U	•		-			1	7			İ		 	1
	il Chack San	ples	17	1	0						1							
REVIEW PROCEDURES COLLECTED P	dor Deficien	cles	18	2000	EVAL CODE													
£ &			19		8										:			
OTHER REVEW			20		פאער.	1				 		1	٠.,					-
SIGNATURE OF REVIEW	1/=0	}	J	_L			1		ı	_1	_1_		DATE	L	<u>:</u>	1	J	

Laboratory:

Istituto Zooprofilattico, Brescia

Address:

Sede Centrale 25124 Brescia.

Via A. Bianchi 7, Italy

Date of Visit:

12/13/01

Reviewer:

Dr. Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Proff. Lodetti Ezio, Director General.

There are US approved slaughter and processing plants in the area but the Quality Control Manager said they do not routinely run samples from US Plants. Most of these samples are processed at the Montova and Cremona laoratories. Samples are brought to the laboratory by employees of ASL in automobiles, are coded in the receiving area and sent to the technician as anonymous samples. This is normal procedure in all of the Italian government laboratories.

Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL.

Methodology used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use an inhouse modification of an ISO method which had been validated internally. This is a repeat finding

Salmonella: Using a modification of ISO method # 6579 which has been internally validated. This is a repeat finding

Generic E. Coli: Use an internally developed method. Repeat finding.

None of these methods have been sent to FSIS for equivalent determination.

Use of Control Organisms: Do not routinely run known bacterial control organisms concurrently with batches of samples to validate test runs.

	U.O. DEPARTMENT O: AGRICUATURE FOOD EAFLYY AND MAPRETTON ECRVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS					(EW D		NAME	OF FOR	ito ito	ABORA ZOC	profi LLE	let	tico
	DREIGN COUNTRY LABORA				1		·.	001	78	CAP	INA	LLE	(Ro	na)
	GOV'T AGENCY	1	_	me me		~ <i>I.r</i>		ADDR	ESS OF A b.E	LABOR LA AL	ATORY <i>India</i> (Societica 10:5410 Vestido :	nair. 3010 no 145	
_a21	Region FREVIEWEN	1						Via		NU	ova	4/Inches	est - Fee Pret. CAN	THE CORT TUE
	Ghias Mughal	NAN	ть о 7)	F FOREIG R h	in offi	ICIAL	40	B			D,	retor	Ge	neval
				7	7 4 2		710	75.	121				7	-
	Residue Code/t	TEM	1					-				!		
	Sample Handling	01		de			-							
DVRES	Sampling Frequency	02	CODE	NA			 							
PROCE	Timely Analyses	03	NOT C	ok										
валяпна гросерияез	Compositing Procedure	04	EVALUA.	NA										<u> </u>
SAN	Interprat Comp Data	Q 5	١	oh										
***********	Data Reporting	06		oh										
.1 (6)	Acceptable Method	07	GODE	U										
ACIAL YTICAL PROCEDURES	Correct Tlesue(s)	80	JON C	NA										
Atial	Equipment Operation	09	WINY.					ļ						
-	Instrument Printouts	10	2	ok!										
	Minimum Detection Levels	11		U		Se	e	AH	och	ed	Co	umen	6	
S E	Recovery Frequency	12]"	NA										
SSURANCE OURES	Percent Recovery	13	8	NA										
QUALITY ASS PROCEDI	Check Sample Frequency	14	A UATIO	OK										-
£ £	All analyst w/Check 6amp	les 15												
8	Correctivo Actions	16]2	OK:										
-	International Chack Sample	les 17		Ok					L					
REVIEW	Corrected Prior Deficiencia	es 18	EVAL CODE											
OTHER REVEN		19	30.6										44-44	
P. S.		20	88											
ANGIR	TURE OF REVIEWEN	1	<u></u>	· · · · · · ·	1		L	.1	1	DATE	1	<u></u>		
-	1													

Laboratory: Istituto Zooprofilattico, Rome

Address: Sede Centrale

00178 CAPANNELLE (Roma), Via Appia Nuova 1411, Italy

Date of Visit: 12/17/01

Reviewer: Dr.Ghias Mughal

Foreign Official: Dott. Nazareno Brizioli Director General.

This laboratory analyses samples from plants approved for export to US. Generally samples are anonymous, however, some times they are marked as "USA-plant"

Laboratory has been accredited by SINAL, have one external audit annually.

Methodolgy Used:

Listeria monocytogenes: Use EN method 45001 at present but will change to IEC 17025 in near future. Will validate this mehtod and sent to FSIS for equivalence determination.

Salmonella: Use ISO method # 6579.

Generic E. Coli: Use AFNOR "coli ID milieu" method.

Director of Quality Control Program indicated that he has no problem using methods acceptable to FSIS but he needs instructions from the Ministry of Health to do so.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIEW DATE ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME				CITY Castelluchhio		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11.	/29/01	Est. 5-L Levoni S.P.A.			COUNTRY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL nd Dr. Minelli			ceptable/ review Unacc	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each							
A = Acceptable M = Margin	iany Ac	ı - 	U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed Formulations	O = Does not a	55
				A 29			A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	A	Packaging materi	als	A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confir	mation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label clai	ms	59 ()
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monito	ring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	dules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equip	ment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing recor	ds	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspe	ction	64
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedure	S	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closur	e exam	66 ()
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim containe	r handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing	handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation proce	edures	69 69
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect	actions plant	
Facilities approval	15 A		ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing cont	rol inspection	
Equipment approval	16 A	4	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/	ECON. FRAUD CONTE	_1
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME			cted product control	44 O	Export product i	dentification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A		ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verific		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	-	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificat		74 A
Product contact equipment	19	Residu	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	-	ling procedures	470	Inspection supe	rvision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	<u> </u>	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of secur		77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O		eval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment secur		78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A		ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verifica		79
Outside premises	24 A	-	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" statu	·	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLI			oning trim	51 A	1 '		81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A		ess meat reinspection	52 O			82
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingra	dients identification	53 A	1		M
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O		ol of restricted ingredients	54 A			+
Daniel / Grooming procedures	U	' ~~```		A	I		1

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	_	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	Castelluchhio
(reverse)	11/29/01	Est. 5-L Levoni S.P.A.	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Castoldi a	IGN OFFICIAL nd Dr. Minelli	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. A The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting the establishment four times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and the duration of visits was between one to three hours.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 82. Establishment met FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program. The HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; and there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plans CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	12-06-01 Est. 23-L Cesare Fiorucci S.P.A.						Langhirano		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-	06-01	Est. 23-L Cesare Fioru	cci S.P.	Α.		COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL			EVALUATION	eptable/		
Dr. Oto Urban CODES (Give an appropriate code for each							eview Unaco	eptable	
A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptab	le	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not ap	ply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination preventi	on	28 A	Formulations		55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	l	^	Packaging materia	als	56 A	
Water potability records	O1 A	Product	t handling and storage	•	30 M	Laboratory confin	mation	57 A	
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning		31 A	Label approvals		58 A	
Back siphonage prevention	O3	Produc	t transportation		32 N	Special label clain	ns	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION	PROGRAM		Inspector monitor	ring	O 60	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance progra	m	33 A	Processing sched	ules	61 O	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation		34 M	Processing equip	ment	O 62	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation		35 M	Processing record	ls	63 O	
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal		36 A	Empty can inspec	tion	64	
Pest control monitoring	eo A		2. DISEASE CONTROL			Filling procedures		65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification		37 O	Container closure	exam	66 O	
Lighting	11 _A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedu	res	38 O	Interim container	handling	67 O	
Operations work space	12 M	Antem	ortem dispositions		O 39	Post-processing t	nandling	68	
Inspector work space	13 A	Human	ne Slaughter		40 O	Incubation proced	lures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedu		41 O	Process. defect a	ctions – plant	70 O	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions		42 O	Processing contro	ol - inspection	710	
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control		43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/EC	CON. FRAUO CONTRO	ж	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control		44	Export product id	entification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework produc	t	45 A	Inspector verifica	tion	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL			Export certificate	s	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	e program compliance		46 O	Single standard		75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures		470	Inspection superv	rision	76	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	e reporting procedure	s	40	Control of securit	ty items	77 _A	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.		49 A	Shipment securit	у	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 M	Storag	ge and use of chemica	ls	\$0 A	Species verificati	on	79	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CO	NTROL		"Equal to" status		80 A	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDUM		1	oning trim		S1 A	Imports		81 O	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection		52 A	НАССР		82 M	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1	dients identification		53 A 54 O				
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients							

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12.00.01	Tre 22 I Consta Financi S D A	
(reverse)	12-06-01	Est. 23-L Cesare Fiorucci S.P.A.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare Al		ceptable/ -review Unacceptable
COMMENTS:			

- 12 There was not enough space for processing operation in the slicing room. The establishment has programmed the extension of this room in the near future.
- 19 Washed, clean trays were observed to contain some pieces of dry meat in the salting room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management.
- 23 The street cloth and the working cloth of two employees were mixed together in one of the dressing room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment employee.
- 30 Product contacting the wall was observed in two of the drying rooms. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment employee.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once or twice a year and operational sanitation twice a week.
- 43 The inedible product has not been denatured in this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

	1				10:51	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NA	CITY Langhirano		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		07/01	Est. 25-L Tosini Pio SPA Industria Pro	osciutti	COUNTRY ITALY	
IAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. E	Borrello &	IGN OFFICIAL Δ Dr. Lidia Cecio		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable	ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGI	RAM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 C
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 66
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 C
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 C
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process, defect actions plant	70 A
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONT	ROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ENT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	71
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO	DL .	"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A	Imports	8
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	8: A
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/07/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 25-L Tosini Pio SPA Industria Prosciutti	CITY Langhirano COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Borrello &	ign official ¿ Dr. Lidia Cecio	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 07. Gaps at the bottoms of the door to deboning room and raw ham receiving room were not sealed properly to prevent the entrance of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed once a year.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment once a week (the establishment operates five days a week). The duration of the visits was between one to two hours

	T = =					
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE		CITY Zola Predosa (E	R)	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11	/27/01	Est. 41-L Alcisa SPA		COUNTRY	
IAME OF REVIEWER Or. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL & Dr. Milane		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable Unacceptable ptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	review	item listed	below)			
A = Acceptable M = Margi	nally Ac		U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not ap	pply 55
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	A	Formulations	A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product	reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 ()
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	RAM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	····	Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 69
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	IOL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPM	ENT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ie program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	470	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storaç	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 [
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDL	ING	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 O	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1 -	lients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		\top

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/27/01	Est. 41-L		CITY Zola Predosa (ER) COUNTRY
		Alcisa SPA	Tevaluation	ITALY
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. Pierantoni	i & Dr. Milane		ceptable/ -review Unacceptable

- 07. Gaps at the bottoms of emergency door leading to processing room were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35 a) The pre-operational and operational sanitation monitoring deficiencies were not identified and any corrective/preventive measures taken were not documented by the establishment personnel. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
 b) GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation twice a month.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 82. Establishment met FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program. The HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	١		Est. 90-L Greci E Folzani S	D.4	. 1	reuno	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM					COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	•	OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL sare		eptable/ Unac	xxeptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = Acceptable \qquad M = Margin$			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not a	spply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materia	als	5G A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirm	nation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claim	าร	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monitor	ing	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	ules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipr	nent	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing record	ls	63 O
Pest control program	08 M	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspec	tion	64 O	
Pest control monitoring	V 60		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures		65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	O Container closure exam		66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	Antemortem inspec. procedures 38 O		Interim container handling		67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 390		Post-processing handling		68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures		69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions - plan		70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing contro	ol inspection	71 0
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONTROL)L
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product id-	entification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	tion	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	s	74 A
Product contact equipment	19	Resido	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	470	Inspection superv	rision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48	Control of securit	y items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	Y	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	on	79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	VG	Pre-b	oning trim	50 0	Imports		81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 M	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	\$2 O	НАССР		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O		rol of restricted ingredients	S4 A			
CCIC CORM OF 20 2 (2/02) REPLACES E	SIS FORM	9520-2 (11	MO WHICH MAY BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTER	o	0	4.000.5.4	

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

| reuno

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-21-01	Est. 90-L Greci E Folzani SPA	•	Felino COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Allodi Ce			ceptable/ review Unacceptable
COMMENTS			•	•

- 4 Waste receptacle cover is hand operated. Establishment will remove the cover from all waste receptacles.
- 8 Insectocuters were observed in all product processing/drying areas. Establishment officials will remove them from the product drying facilities.
- 25 One employee was observed with not completely covered street cloths. This deficiency was corrected by the establishment management.
- 34, 35 The SSOP pre-operational sanitation preventive action was missing. The official inspector was performing pre-operational and operational sanitation once or twice a week.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

	7					
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	νE	CITY Tavernerio	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		19/01	Est. 92 M/S Fumagalli Industria Alimenta	A. COUNTRY ITALY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Or. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr.G	ridavilla,	ign official Dr.Borrello,Dr.Castoldi,Dr.Co	EVALUATION X Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable	eptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margi			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	= Not Reviewed O = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing 29 A			Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	os A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64 O	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	Container closure exam	66 O	
Lighting	11A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	Interim container handling	67 ()	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 35		Post-processing handling	68 0
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 U	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTE	ROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPM	ENT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 1
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDL	ING	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingred	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11/19/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 92 M/S Fumagalli Industria Alimentare S.P.A.		CITY Tavemerio COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr.Gridavilla,	 IGN OFFICIAL Dr.Borrello,Dr.Castoldi,Dr.Cecio		ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 19. Meat grinding equipment and band saw ready for use in the cold boning room were found with fat and pieces of meat from previous days' operation. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a week.
- 41. Inspector was not incising and observing mandibular lymph nodes of hog heads. The mesenteric lymph nodes and spleen were not palpated as required in Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. GOI meat inspection officials did not take any corrective actions.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 82. Establishment met FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program. The HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	- 10	07.01	F . 151 7	o b	4 1	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-	07-01	Est. 151-L Leoncini Prosciut	ti 5.P.,	COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	Dr. V	isentini .	IGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable Acceptable Acceptable Unac	ceptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = A$ cceptable $M = M$ argin			U = Unacceptable	N ,=	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 O	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM.	Inspector monitoring	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	Animal identification 37		Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec, procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42	Processing control inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONTRO	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 _A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 _A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	e program compliance	46	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 _A	Sampl	ing procedures	10	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 _A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	45	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	SO A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE		1	oning trim	S1 A	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A		ess meat reinspection	S2 A	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	² 70	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-07-01	Est. 151-L Leoncini Prosciutti S.P.	A .	COUNTRY laly
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Visentini	IGN OFFICIAL		cceptable/ Unacceptable

- 30 Hair on several hams and product contacting walls in three cases were observed in three dryers. There was immediate corrective action taken by the establishment management.
- 31 There was no written program for handling of dropped product in this establishment. These deficiencies were scheduled for correction.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a week and operational sanitation once a week.
- 43 No identification of inedible metal boxes were observed in the slicing room

76a The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

- 76b Internal reviews were performed only four times per year.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation. A clear description of the risk of one of the CCPs was missing; establishment management agreed to re-write the section.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NA	ME	CITY Piemonte	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	20/01	Est. 160-L Raspini SPA	COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL ancuso & Dr. Voghera, Vet.	IIC	EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review X Unacc	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not ap	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL			ontamination prevention	Formulations	55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROG	RAM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	°7 U	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 U	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	Antemortem inspec. procedures 0		Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 390 O		Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTE	 30L
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 U	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Resido	ie program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A		ing procedures	470		76 U
Dry storage areas	21 U	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 [
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO	DL	"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 O	Imports	81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingred	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

CITY

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 160-L	CITY Piemonte
(reverse)	11/20/01	Raspini SPA	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Alberto M	IGN OFFICIAL Iancuso & Dr. Voghera, Vet. IIC	ceptable/ review X Unacceptable

- 7, 8, 21. The front and one side of dry storage room had no walls (partially protected with plastic curtains) to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Mice droppings, wet floor with urine, cobwebs, dirt and debris were observed in the dry storage room and packaging materials were not stored on racks high enough to monitor pest control and sanitation programs. Evidence of rodent infestation was observed on December 20, 2000, January 5, and November 8, 2001, in the personnel offices and welfare rooms by the outside pest control company, during their routine monitoring program. Rodenticide was replaced in the bait boxes but no other effort was made to take corrective/preventive measures either by the pest control company/establishment personnel/GOI meat inspection officials.
- 17. Dripping condensate from overhead refrigeration units, rails, beams, and ceilings that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, was falling onto edible product that was exposed from broken packaged materials in the defrosting room. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective actions.
- 19. Flaking paint and rust was observed on working table and frame of working table in the processing room. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 26. Several employees were not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent direct product contamination such as: paper towels were kept under the cutting boards soaked with blood in the boning room; packaged edible product was not unpacked in a sanitary manner in the grinding room; employees' handling unclean trash container were also handling edible product without washing hands. Establishment officials took corrective actions in each case.
- 34, 35 A. The daily operational sanitation records did not reflect the actual sanitary conditions observed in the establishment.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational and operational sanitation two times a month.
- 43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent cross contamination and/or cross utilization in the boning room. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection covereage. Inspector was visiting the establishment three times a week (the establishment operates five days a week) and staying between one to three hours each visit.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 80. Because of gross product contamination, inadequate pest control program, and lack of compliance of daily operational sanitation programs and procedures, inadequate inspectional controls, the status of this establishment is not equivalent to that required in the U.S programs. All the above deficiencies were discussed with Dr. Alberto Mancuso, Regional Veterinarian, and he agreed to remove Establishment 160-L from the list of establishments eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States, effective November 20, 2001.
- 82. Establishment met FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP programs. The HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not bee validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations; and pre-shipment document reviews were not being conducted by establishment officials.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	ΛE	CITY Reggio Nell Emi	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	13/01	13/01 Est. 172-L Unibon Salumi Soc. Coop. A.R.L.		COUNTRY ITALY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			I IGN OFFICIAL I, Dr. Noe, Dr. Lidia,Dr. Berg	omi	EVALUATION Acceptable X Acceptable/ Re-review Unacce	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not ap	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 ()
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 M	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	l identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66
Lighting	111 .	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	36 O	Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	38	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humai	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	emned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	₹OL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPM	ENT	Restri	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Reside	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDL	ING	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A		81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bone	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingre	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Cont	rol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/13/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 172-L	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	CITY Reggio Nell Emilia
	12/13/01	Unibon Salumi Soc. Coop. A.R.L.		ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Pierantoni	IGN OFFICIAL , Dr. Noe, Dr. Lidia,Dr. Bergomi	EVALUATION Acceptable X Re-	Ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 05. Two sanitizers were not maintained at the required temperature (82C) in the boning room. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 19. Fat scraps from previous operations were observed on nmerous ham racks for use in an equipment cleaning room. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action.
- 26. An employee was not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent direct product contamination such as: he was observed handling containers for inedible product/dirty fork lift without washing hands, then handled edible product in the boning room. Establishment took corrective actions.
- 30. Hams were contacting dirty posts during transportation creating a potential for cross contamination in the boning room. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35 A. The daily pre-operational sanitation deficiencies were not identified and operational sanitation was not performed by the establishment personnel.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational and operational sanitation once a week. The establishment operated five days a week.
- 43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not properly identified to prevent possible cross-contamination and/or cross utilization. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. Establishment met FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program. The HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow, the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete, there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP, there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; and there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	1F	CITY	
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS					San Daniele D F	ruili
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	03/01	Est. 205-L Principe Di San Daniele SPA	COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL ; Dr. Renato Coassin, Reg. Di	EVALUATION X Acceptable Acceptable Unacce	eptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not ap	ylqc
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL			contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	Waste disposal		Empty can inspection	64 ()
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	70 A
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	ROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ENT	Restri	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resido	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Reside	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	76 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 (
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	ING	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A		dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)		ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 205-L	CITY San Daniele D Fruili
	12/03/01	Principe Di San Daniele SPA	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. Caliz, IIC	EIGN OFFICIAL ; Dr. Renato Coassin, Reg. Dir.	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immedicately.
- 34, 35 A. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing adequate daily inspection covereage. Inspector was visiting establishment one to two times a week (the establishment worked five days per week). The duration of the visits was between one to two hours.

 B. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The dialy pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed one to two times a month.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. The supervisory visits that were performed were not done monthly. Only four visits were conducted per year by the local distric/provincial officials.
- 79. Species verification was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	F	CITY		
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS				_	Santa Palomba		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	15/01	Est. 272-M/S Cesare Fiorucci S.P.A.		COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER			IGN OFFICIAL Di Sandro, Dr.Adriano Giorgi	oni	EVALUATION Acceptable/		
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	1			OILI	X Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacc	ceptable	
A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptable	·	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	ipply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention 28 M			Formulations		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing 29 A			Packaging materials		
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation		
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims		
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monitoring		
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing records	O 63	
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66 O	
Lighting	M	Antemortem inspec. procedures		38 A	Interim container handling	67 ()	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O	
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 U	Process. defect actions plant	70 O	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	71 _A	
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control 43 U		-	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL		
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restricted product control 44 Export product identifie			Export product identification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76 1	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Reside	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77	
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	7E	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	75	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-be	oning trim	51 A	Imports	8:	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	8. N	
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingre	dients identification	53 O			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	 CITY Santa Palomba
	11/15/01	Est. 272-M/S Cesare Fiorucci S.P.A.	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Alessandra Di Sandro, Dr. Adriano Giorgioni		ceptable/ Unacceptable

- 11. Light was inadequate at the hog head inspection station. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 26. An employee was not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent product contamination such as: he was observed picking up pieces of meat from the floor and, without washing his hands, handled edible product in the boning room. Establishment officials took corrective action immediately.
- 28. Dirty water was falling from carcass splitting saw onto hog carcass during carcass splitting in the slaughter room. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action.
- 41. Inspector was not incising and observing mandibular lymph nodes of hog heads. The mesenteric lymph nodes and spleen were not palpated as required in Council Directive 64/433/EEC of 26 June 1964. GOI inspection officials did not take any corrective actions.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	1E	CITY Macaria (MN)	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	/23/01	Est. 304 M/S Mec Carni S.P.A.		COUNTRY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry		ME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Castoldi, Dr. Noe, and Dr. Pasin EVALUATION Acceptable				cceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			s below) U = Unacceptable	نــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	Not Reviewed O = Does not	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL			contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing		29 A	Packaging materials	56
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing records	63
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	Waste disposal		Empty can inspection	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 ()
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures		38 A	Interim container handling	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 ()
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 U	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions plant	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	n 710
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	Condemned product control 43 U		5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resido	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 C
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	1G	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	_	dients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME 11/23/01 Est. 304 M/S Mec Carni S.P.A.		CITY Macaria (MN) COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Castoldi,	 EIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Noe, and Dr. Pasin	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 40. Hogs were not stunned in such a manner that they would be rendered unconscious with a minimum excitement and discomfort. A few hogs were observed staggering and crawling on the top of other stunned hogs and their throats were slit by the employee without further stunning. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plans(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U. O. OCCUPATIVE OF ACCUSULTURE	051/15	A/DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM		CITY	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE		E	Castelverde	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	/21/01 Est. 312-M/S Coop. Agricola Bertana S.r.L.		COUNTRY	1	
NAME OF REVIEWER					EVALUATION X Acceptable Acceptable Unacce	
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	.1				Acceptable Re-review Unacce	eptable
A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptable		Not Reviewed 0 = Does not as	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	oss contamination prevention 28 A Form		Formulations	()
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) €	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	\M	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing records	O 63
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	l identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	M	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 A	Interim container handling	67
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humai	ne Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	"o
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	emned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	IOL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ENT	Restri	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	1	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 #
Other product areas (inside)	20 A		ling procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	76
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	75
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDL		1	oning trim	51 A	Imports	6:
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bone	less meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 O	•	
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Cont	rol of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11/21/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 312-M/S Coop. Agricola Bertana S.r.L.	CITY Castelverde COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Noe and Dr. Castoldi		ceptable/ Unacceptable

- 11. Light was inadequate and not shadow proof at the hog head, viscera, and carcass inspection stations in the slaughter room. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under visual inspectional supervision or locked or sealed before shipping for rendering. It was kept in the open containers outside the premises. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow; the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	t		Langhirano	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12	-05-01	Est. 316-L Emilia Romagna-1	Giancarlo	COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		e of fore Cesare Al	IGN OFFICIAL Iodi			ceptable/ Unaccept	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each							
A = Acceptable M = Margin	ally Ac	ceptable	U = Unacceptable	N :	Not Reviewed	O = Does not app	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	als	
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confir	mation	
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	:	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ns	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monito	ring	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	ules	
Establishments separation	A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing record	is	
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspec	ction	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O 38 O	Container closure exam		
Lighting	11'A	Antem	Antemortem inspec. procedures		Interim container	handling	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing t	nandling	
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation proces	lures	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant		
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing contro	ol - inspection	
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/E	CON. FRAUD CONTRO	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product id	entification	
Over-product ceilings	174	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	tion	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	s	
Product contact equipment	19 M	Resido	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard		
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47	Inspection superv	rision	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Reside	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of securit	y items	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Аррго	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	1	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	on	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status		
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE		1	oning trim	51 O	Imports		
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O			
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27	<u></u>	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			
ECIC ECIDAL 9520.2 (2/93) REPLACES F	SIS FOR	4 9520-2 (11	901, WHICH MAY BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTED	D.	Octioned on Succession	4 900 Saftware by Dat	

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12.05.01	Est. 316-L Emilia R	omoons Tonors	Giancarlo	rangimano
(reverse)	12-05-01	EST. 310-L Cuilla R	Olliagila- i aliai a	Gialicario	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare All			EVALUATION Acceptable Acc	ceptable/ review Unacceptable
COMMENTS:					
7 Spider web was observer on the ceili	ing and wooden	racks for ham in the o	drying room. T	his deficiency was co	orrected immediately
by the establishment management.					,
19 Few deep cuts were observe in the c	conveyor belt in	the salting room. Th	is was schedule	d for correction by th	e establishment.
30 Several hams were observed contact immediately by the establishment mana		the door in the restin	ig and the dryin	g room. This deficie	ncy was corrected
34, 35 The government inspector was pleast once a week. The operational san				mes a year and opera	itional sanitation at
43 The inedible plastic container was r inedible product have not been denature			s was scheduled	l for correction by the	e establishment. The
76 The FSIS auditors could find little of levels of supervision by the central measurement actions in the event that the	nt inspection aut	ority. It was not clea	ir who would be	responsible for the i	

	T = =:			45		T OUT V	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME				CITY Emilia Romagn	ıa
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	/22/01	Est. 335-L CIM Alimbntari SPA			COUNTRY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL , Local Supervisor			ceptable/	ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	review	item listed	l below)				
A = Acceptable M = Margin	nally Ac		U = Unacceptable	28	Not Reviewed Formulations	O = Does not	apply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	A 20			4 1 56
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging mater	ials	, 30 . A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confi	rmation	57
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label cla	ims	59
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monito	oring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sche	dules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	pment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing reco	rds	63
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedure	es	65 ()
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	1		
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38			
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions		Post-processing handling		00
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation proc	edures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plan		t 70
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing con	trol inspectio	n 71
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE	/ECON. FRAUD CON	TROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ENT	Restri	cted product control	44 A	Export product	identification	72
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verific	cation	73
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certifica	tes	74
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resid	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	1	75
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supe	ervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of secu	rity items	77
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment secu	rity	78
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verifica	ation	76
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO	L	"Equal to" stat	us	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	ING	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A	Imports		: 81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		8.
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Conti	rol of restricted ingredients	54 A			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11/22/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 335-L CIM Alimbutari SPA		CITY Emilia Romagna COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION	ITALY
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. Cozzolino	Or. Cozzolino, Local Supervisor		

- 7. Gaps at the bottoms of door in the shipping room were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month and operational sanitation between three to four times a year.
- 43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination and/or cross utilization in the boning room. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection covereage. Inspector was visiting the establishment two to three times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and the duration of the visits was between one to two lours.
- 79. Species verification was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAN	ΛE	CITY	
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	11/	28/01 Est. 363-L		Villa Franca		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	20/01	Montorse Francesco e Figli S	.P.A.	COUNTRY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL Upervisor, & Dr. Residoni, IIC		EVALUATION Acceptable/	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Acceptable Acceptable X Una	cceptable
A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not	apply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	. 55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 ()
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64 ()	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	Animal identification 370		Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	Antemortem inspec. procedures 38 O		Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 39		Post-processing handling	
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plan	t 70 A
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	n 71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONT	rrol
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME		Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 U	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 M	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storaç	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 1
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN		ı	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 U
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1 -	lients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME 11/28/01 Est. 363-L		CITY Villa Franca
	11/28/01	Montorse Francesco e Figli S.P.A.	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Foroni, St	ign official upervisor, & Dr. Residoni, IIC	ceptable/ review X Unacceptable

- 17. Dripping condensate, from overhead refrigeration units, ceilings, beams, and pipes that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, in fresh product receiving room, corridors, fresh product cooler, and boning room was falling onto exposed edible product. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action.
- 19. Numerous racks for edible product ready for use in the fresh product receiving room were found with fat and pieces of meat from the previous day's operation. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action.
- 21. Cobwebs and dirt were observed in the dry storage room and packaging material was not stored on racks high enough to monitor pest control and sanitation programs.
- 30. Hams were contacting unclean fork lift during transportation in the receiving room. Establishment officials took corrective action immediately.
- 34, 35 A. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring records did not reflect the actual sanitation conditions observed in the establishment and operational sanitation monitoring record was not adequately maintained.
- B. The GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operation sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed twice a month.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 80. Because of gross product contamination and lack of a compliance with daily pre-operational and operational sanitation/equivalent sanitation programs and procedures, inadequate inspectional controls, and noncompliance with basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program, the status of this establishment is not equivalent to that required in the U.S. program. All of the above deficiencies were discussed with Dr. Foroni, Supervisor, and Dr. Residoni, IIC, and they agreed to remove Establishment 363-L from the list of establishments eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States, effective November 28, 2001.
- 82. This establishment did <u>not</u> meet some of the FSIS basic regulatory requirements of the HACCP program. In addition, the HACCI plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; there was not a HACCP plan for each product where a hazard had been identified; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; pre-shipment document reviews were not being conducted by establishment officials.

NOTE: This establishment was evaluated as acceptable/re-review in last audit in May 2001.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	ME	CITY Medolago		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	30/01	Est. 368-L Wuber SPA	COUNTRY			
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL L Dr. Raccagni Mario, IIC		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Review Unec	ceptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	: Not Reviewed O = Does not a	apply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		30			Formulations	55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O	
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A	
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A	
Pest control program	08	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection			
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures	65 O		
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O	
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	36			
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 0	
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 69	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	t 70	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	n 71 A	
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONT	ROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL	·····	Export certificates	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	1 '	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 U	
Dry storage areas	21 M	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80 A	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A		81 A	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	\$2 O	НАССР	82 M	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	\$3 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/30/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 368-L	CITY Medolago COUNTRY
(reverse)		Wuber SPA	ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Castoldi &	den official de Dr. Raccagni Mario, IIC	eptable/ review Unacceptable

- 7, 21. Gaps at the sides of door in the dry storage room were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35 A. The daily operational sanitation deficiencies were not identified and any corrective actions taken were not documented by the establishment personnel. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring deficiencies were not identified and any corrective actions taken were not documented. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed once a week.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	ME	CITY San Daniele D F	riul	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	05/01	Est. 442-L Levoni SPA	COUNTRY			
NAME OF REVIEWER			IGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION		
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry CODES (Give an appropriate code for each to	1		r. Alessandro Visentini	i	X Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacc	eptable	
A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed 0 = Does not a	pply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O	
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA		Inspector monitoring	60 A	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A	
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam		
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim container handling		
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling		
Inspector work space	13 O	Human	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postmo	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant	70 O	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A	
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	łOL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMEN	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Export certificates	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ie program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	10	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1 -	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/05/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 442-L Levoni SPA	CITY San Daniele D Friul COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Caliz & D	I EIGN OFFICIAL Or. Alessandro Visentini	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed one to two times a month.
- 43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not identified in the fresh ham receiving room. Establishment officials took corrective action immediately.
- B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. The supervisory visits that were performed were not done monthly. Only four visits were conducted per year by the local district/provincial officials.
- C. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing adequate daily inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment one to two times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and between one to two hours each visit.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; and there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	12-04-01 Est. 476-L Salumificio GIULLE s.p.a.			Langnirano			
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12.				p.a.	COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	Drs.	Cesare Á	IGN OFFICIAL llodi & Alberto Paratica	EVALUATION X Acceptable Re-	eptable/ eview Unacc	eptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each of A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N	= Not Reviewed	O = Does not ap	oply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials		56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirm	mation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	transportation	32 N	Special label clain	ns	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector monitor	ing	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	ules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipo	nent	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing record	ls	63 O
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspec	tion	64 O
Pest control monitoring	60 V		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure	exam	66 O
Lighting	11 _A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling		67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling		68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	e Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures		
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions - plant		70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing contro	ol - inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONTROL		
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restricted product control 44A			Export product identification		72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	tion	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	S	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resido	e program compliance	46	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	170	Inspection superv	rision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48	Control of securi	ty items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securit	Y	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verificati	on	79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL	•	"Equal to" status		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANOLM	4G	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 O	Imports		81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12.04.01	Est 476 I SalumiGaia CIIII I E a		Laugimeno
(reverse)	12-04-01	Est. 476-L Salumificio GIULLE s.p	o.a.	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Drs. Cesare A	IGN OFFICIAL Ilodi & Alberto Paratica	EVALUATION Acceptable Re-	ceptable/ Unacceptable
COMMENTS:				
17 The flaking paint over the table used correction by the establishment.	d for introducing	g the fat on hams was observed in the	fatting room. This	was scheduled for
30 Several hams were observe contactino official.	ng walls in the s	salting and drying rooms. This was co	orrected immediately	by the establishment
34, 35 The government inspector was The table used for salting is checked du action was missing.				
43 The inedible product was not being	denatured in th	is establishment.		
76. The FSIS auditor could find little elevels of supervision by the central mecorrective actions in the event that the	at inspection aut	hority. It was not clear who would be	responsible for the	•
82. The establishment's HACCP progapplicable regulatory requirements for		· · · · · ·	(s) did not address a	lequately the

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	i		5 400 t 5 15 1 ME		00.45	Faillia		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	23-01	Est. 480-L Prosciuttificio "II	Mulin	COUNTRY Italy			
IAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL sare			ceptable/ review	Unacceptable	
ODES (Give an appropriate code for each of A = Acceptable M = Margin			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed .	O = Does	s not apply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	26 A	Formulations		55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES	(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		ent Sanitizing	25 A	Packaging mater	ials	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation			
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals			
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ms	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monito	ring	60 O	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 M	Processing sched	dules	61 O	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	62 O	
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing record	ds	63 O	
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	34 _A	Empty can inspec	ction	64 _O	
Pest control monitoring	09 M		2. DISEASE CONTROL	<u> </u>	Filling procedures			
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37	Container closure	e exam	66 O	
Lighting	114	Antem	ortem inspec, procedures	38 O	Interim container	handling	67 O	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions		Post-processing	handling	68 O	
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures			
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	10	Process. defect actions - plant			
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42	Processing contr	ol – inspec	ction 71 O	
Equipment approval	16	Conde	mned product control	43 U	S. COMPLIANCE/E	CON. FRAUD	CONTROL	
(L) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ντ	Restric	cted product control	14A	Export product id	Sentificatio	n 72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector venifica	ation	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	es	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	ue program compliance	40	Single standard		75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	170	Inspection super	vision	7€	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	se reporting procedures	460	Control of securi	ty items	77 A	
Antemortem facilities	22 0	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securit	Y	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	\$0 A	Species verificati	ion	79 O	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	}	80 A	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	4G	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports		81 O	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	\$2 O	НАССР		82 1	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1 -	dients identification	53 A				
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	1 sh				

REVIEW DATE | ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND TANKE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Parma

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-23-01	Est. 480-L Prosciuttificio "Il M	Parma COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Allodi Ce			Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable
COMMENTS:				

- 4 Hand-operated waste receptacles observed in two dressing rooms and no paper towel at the hand washing facility observed in one dressing room. These deficiencies were corrected immediately by the establishment management.
- 7 Insect and and spider web observed in the drying room. This was corrected immediately by the company employee.
- 9 There is no corrective action taken by the contracting company in case of repeated findings of rodent activity in the same location. The frequency of visits is also insufficient (4 times a year). This deficiency was scheduled for correction.
- 19 The conveyor belt had several deep cuts in the salting room. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment officials.
- 7/33 There was a space large enough for rodent to get under the door in the shipping area. This deficiency was scheduled for correction by the establishment officials.
- 34, 35 The daily pre-operational sanitation deficiencies were not clearly identified and the government inspector was performing pre-operational and operational sanitation twice a week.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation. Hazard analysis decisions were not justified, corrective actions to be taken when critical limits were exceeded were not sufficiently described, and the description of the verification of the CCP was not specific, but rather a combination of several CCPs.

MINTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS			D	<i>~</i> · ·			Lianco	v	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	-19-01 Est. 492-L Lombardia Salumficio Menatti SRL				COUNTRY Italy			
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL a		EVALUATION Acceptable		ceptable/ review	Unac	:Ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each of A = Acceptable M = Margin			l below) U = Unacceptable	N :	= Not Reviewe	ed	O = 0	oes not a	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	128			55 A		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	23 A	Packaging	materi	rials		
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	roduct handling and storage M		Laboratory confirmation				57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label appro	ovals			58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special lab	el clair	ากร		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector r	nonito	ring		60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing	sched	lules		61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 _U	Processing	equip	ment		62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing	recor	ds		63 O
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	**	Empty can	inspe	ction		64 O
Pest control monitoring	60 W		2. DISEASE CONTROL Filling procedure				s		65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container	closure	e exam		66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	36 O	Interim co	ntaine	handli	ng	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	no	Post-proce	ssing	handlin	g	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Human	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation	proce	dures		69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	10	Process. d	efect	actions	plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing	contr	ol ins	pection	70
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTRO			ROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44	Export pro	duct id	dentific	ation	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector	verific	ation		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	1	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export cer	tificate	es		74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Resido	e program compliance	460	Single sta	ndard			75
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	170	Inspection	super	vision'		76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48	Control of	secur	ity item	s	777 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment	securi	tγ		78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	23 Storage and use of chemicals 50 Species w			Species v	erificat	tion		79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to"	statu	s		80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN		1	oning trim	SI A	Imports			-	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\top
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingred	dients identification	\$3 A					
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	St A					\top
ECIC CORM 0520.2 (2/03) REPLACES F	SIS FORM	9520-2 (11/	901, WHICH MAY BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTE	O.	Decine	400 8-50	O14 BOO SA	A D	4ine

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SEE SINTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Piantego

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-19-01	Est. 492-L Lombardia Salumficio N	Piantedo COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Luigi Fest			ceptable/ Unacceptable
COMMENTS:				

- 17 Flaking paint over the product observed in the cooler and over the product area in the massaging room. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.
- 19 Dry meat was observed on the brine pumping equipment after the pre-operational sanitation.
- 28 Several clean metal cars and edible plastic bins were contacting the floor with the edge used for processing edible product in the area of pumping room, spice room storage and halls. This was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.
- 30 Hair and oil found on hams in the receiving cooler. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.
- 34,35 The government inspector was present in the plant for 1.5 hrs a day, five days a week. The pre-operational sanitation was performed 2 or 3 times a month. The establishment SSOP records did not indicate any deficiencies during the cleaning while some deficiencies were found during the on-site visit. Additionally, there was too much time given by the inspection service for correction of the deficiency that required immediate attention. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment and the Inspection Service.
- 43 Inedible and edible plastic barrels were not properly identified in the casing room. This deficiency was scheduled for correction by the establishment.
- 43 The inedible product is not denatured in this establishment.
- 76 (a) The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 76 (b) The internal review records indicated that the reviewer had requested a boning table in May 2001; this request had not yet been fulfilled. Immediate correction was performed by the establishment officials.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	ΛE		CITY Carpegna		_
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	06/01	Est. 500-L Carpegna Prosciutti SPA			COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL Veterinarian in Charge			ceptable/	Unacceptab	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	review	item listed	below)				-	
A = Acceptable M = Margin	ally Ac		U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed 0 = Does not a		not apply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	A	Formulations 		A 56	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging mater	ials	A	
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	oduct handling and storage $^{30}_{ m M}$ Laboratory co		Laboratory confi	rmation	57	3
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals		58	A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label cla	ims	59	0
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monito	oring	60	A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sche	dules	61	A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equi	pment	62	A A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing reco	rds	63	3 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	³⁶ Empty can inspection			4 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL Filling procedur				es	65	5 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	nimal identification 37 Container closu			re exam	66	6 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures 38 Interior		Interim containe	er handling	6	0	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing	handling	6	0
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation proc	Incubation procedures		O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect	Process. defect actions plant		°O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing con	trol inspe	ection 7	A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	emned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE	/ECON. FRAUD	CONTROL	_
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restri	cted product control	44 O	Export product	identificati	on ⁷	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verifi	cation	1	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certifica	tes	7	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Resid	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard			75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection sup	ervision		76 (
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of secu	rity items	-	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment secu	rity		78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verific	ation		79 (
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" stat	us		80 (
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A	Imports		Ì	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bone	less meat reinspection	52 O				82 U
Personal hygiene practices	26 U		dients identification	53 A				
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Cont	rol of restricted ingredients	54 A		· ···=		_

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/06/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 500-L Compagne Procedute SPA		CITY Carpegna COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FORE	Carpegna Prosciutti SPA IGN OFFICIAL , Veterinarian in Charge	EVALUATION	ITALY
Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	Dr. Magaiotti	, vetermanan in Charge		review X Unacceptable

- 19. Fat residue and dirt from previous days' operation was observed on working table ready for use in processing room. Establishment officials ordered correction. This is a repeat deficiency from last audit.
- 26. An employee was not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent product contamination in the deboning room such as: employee handling unclean inedible product container and, without washing hands, handled edible product. Neither establishment nor GOI inspection officials took corrective action.
- 30. Hams were contacting inedible product containers and walls in the deboning room. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 31. Product that contacted the floor was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 34, 35 A. The daily pre-opeational and operational sanitation monitoring deficiencies were not identified and any corrective actions taken were not documented by the establishment personnel and SSOP records did not reflect the actual sanitary conditions observed in the establishment.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed once and operational sanitation three times a week but no record was maintained.
- 43 A. A few edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination and/or cross utilization in ham deboning room. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 76 A. Jan 1 Dec. 6 there were monthly supervisory visits but not a single deficiency was identified. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment three times a week (the establishment was operating five days a week) and the duration of visits was between five to six hours.
- 80. Because of product contamination, lack of compliance with daily pre-operational and operational sanitation/equivalent sanitation programs and procedures, inadequate inspectional controls, and noncompliance with FSIS basic regulatory requirements of HACCP program, the status of this establishment is not equivalent to that required in the U.S. program. All the above deficiencies were discussed with Dr. Magalotti, IIC, and he agreed to remove Establishment 500-L from the list of establishments eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States, effective December 6, 2001.
- 82. This establishment did <u>not</u> meet some of the FSIS basic regulatory requirements of the HACCP programs. In addition, the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow; the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; the intended use of the product or end user had not been identified; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; and there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPS, or the records did not show actual values and observations.

NOTE: This establishment was recommended for re-review during the last audit in May 2001.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	L		Corm	iglia	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	-30-01	Est. 513-L Italfine S.R.L.	.L.		COUN		 ,
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL lodi		EVALUATION X Acceptable	Acceptable/ Re-review	Unacc	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r					Mad Davis			
A = Acceptable M = Margina	any Ac		U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	0 =	Does not ar	oply 55
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention		Formulations			A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging ma	aterials		56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	Product handling and storage $\binom{30}{A}$ La		Laboratory co	onfirmatio	n	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approva	als		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label	claims		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAI	м	Inspector mo	nitoring		60
Sanitizers	os M	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing so	chedules		61
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing ed	quipment		62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records			63
Pest control program	80	Waste	disposal	osal 36 Empty can insp		spection		64 O
Pest control monitoring	eo A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	1	Filling proced	lures		65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam		n	66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim conta	iner hand	ling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-process	ing handli	ng	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	400	Incubation pr	rocedures		69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	10	Process. defe	ect action	s – plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing c	ontrol in	spection	710
Equipment approval	16	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIA	NCE/ECON. FF	AUD CONTR	OL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 _A	Export produ	ct identifi	cation	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector ver	rification		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certifi	icates		74 _A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resido	e program compliance	46	Single standa	ard		75
Other product areas (inside)	20 M	Sampl	ling procedures	170	Inspection su	upervision		76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of se	ecurity ite	าาร	77
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment se	curity		71
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	SO A	Species veri	fication		7
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" s	tatus		8
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLM		•	oning trim	51 A	Imports			ε
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР			1
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A				
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 C	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O				
0.00		4 05 30 2 44 4	MAN MANON MAN OF LOCK LINES CVILLISTEE					

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-30-01	Est. 513-L Italfine S.R.L.		Comment					
(reverse)	11-50-01	Est. 515 E tallille 5.10.5.		COUNTRY Italy					
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Qio Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare Al		EVALUATION X Acceptable Re-	peptable/ review Unacceptable					
COMMENTS:									
5 The water temperature was 78-79C i	n sanitizer in th	e trimming room. This deficiency wa	s corrected immedia	tely by the					
establishment officials.									
17 The flaking paint was observed over establishment management.	r the table used	for edible product in the fatting room.	This was scheduled	I for correction by the					
20 The plastic container with equipment parts used for processing edible product was observed to be set directly on the floor. This									
deficiency was corrected immediately by	y the establishm	ent management.							
34, 35 Dirty equipment (meat scraps of immediately by the establishment employerrection by the establishment manage operational sanitation three times in two	oyees. The SSO ment. The gove	OP procedure's preventive action was	missing. This was s	cheduled for					
43 The inedible product was not denate	43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment								
76. The FSIS auditor could find little e levels of supervision by the central measurement actions in the event that the	at inspection aut	hority. It was not clear who would be	responsible for the	•					
82. The establishment's HACCP prog applicable regulatory requirements for			(s) did not address ac	lequately the					

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS			- c			Langhirano		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	27-01	Est. 514-L Unibon Salumi			COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL			Ceptable/ . Unacc	peptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = A$ cceptable $M = M$ argin						O = Does not a	es not apply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		\$5 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	als	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confir	mation	57 A	
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	Label approvals				
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ms	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(4) (STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector monito	ring	60 O	
Sanitizers	os A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	Processing sched	lules	61 O		
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	62 O	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	Processing record	ds .	63 O		
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspe	ction	64 O		
Pest control monitoring	eo A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures				
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	l identification	37 O	Container closure	e exam	66 O	
Lighting	11 M	Antem	ortem inspec, procedures	38 O	Interim container	handling	67 O	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing	handling	68 O	
Inspector work space	13 A	Humai	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation proce	dures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant		70 O	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing contr	ol inspection	71	
Equipment approval	16	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/E	E/ECON, FRAUD CONTROL		
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restri	cted product control	44 _A	Export product is	dentification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 _A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	ation	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	es	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resid	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	470	Inspection super	vision	76 U	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of securi	ity items	77 A	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securi	ty	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verificat	tion	79 O	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" statu	S	80 A	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-b	oning trim	\$1 O	Imports		81 O	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bone	less meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		82 N	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1	dients identification	53 A				
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O		rol of restricted ingredients	54 O				
FSIS FORM 9520-2 (2/93) REPLACES F	SIS FORM	9520-2 (11	7901, WHICH MAY BE USED UNTIL EXHAUST	EO.	Designed on PerFO	RM PRO Saleware by Delri	na .	

Langhirano

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	Langni	LYIN			
(reverse)	11-27-01	Est. 514-L Unibon Salumi		COUNT Italy	RY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Zacharini	IGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION X Acceptable A	Cceptable/	Unacceptab
COMMENTS:	<u></u>		,,		
II Inspection table needs to be installed establishment.	d under the suff	icient light in the ham receiving area.	This deficiency wi	ll be corr	ected by the
30 Excessive hair found on several care establishment management.	asses in the diff	crent stage of drying and salting. The	e corrective action v	vill be tak	en by the
34, 35 Preventive action was missing a sanitation. The government inspector wand when asked by the establishment.				•	•
43 The inedible product was not denate	ured in this esta	blishment.			
76. The FSIS auditor could find little elevels of supervision by the central measurement actions in the event that the	nt inspection aut	hority. It was not clear who would be	e responsible for the		
82. The establishment's HACCP prograpplicable regulatory requirements for			(s) did not address a	idequately	the

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	REVIE	W DATE ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NA	ME		CITY	
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		14/01 Est. 550-L			Felino	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	Casale SPA			COUNTRY ITALY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry		of foreign official foneli, IIC; Dr. Daate; Dr. Noe, Dr. L	Lidi		eptable/ review Unacce	sptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = Acceptable$ $M = Margin$			N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not ap	ply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	als	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confir	mation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 A	Special label clair	ms	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROG	RAM	Inspector monito	ring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program 33 Processing sch			dules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation 34 Processing ed			ment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	Processing recor	ds	63 A	
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	Empty can inspe	ction	64 O	
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedure	\$	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 O	Container closur	e exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec, procedures	38 38	Interim containe	r handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 39	Post-processing	handling	68 68
Inspector work space	13 O	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation proce	edures	69 0
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect	actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing contr	rol inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE	ECON. FRAUD CONTR	OL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restricted product control	44 O	Export product i	dentification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verific	ation	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificat	es	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supe	rvision	76 L
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of secur	rity items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment secur	ity	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verifica	tion	79
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" statu	ıs	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-boning trim	51 A			81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	•	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients	54 A			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	 CITY Felino
	12/14/01	Est. 550-L Casale SPA	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Boneli, II	ign official C; Dr. Daate; Dr. Noe, Dr. Lidi	ceptable/ -review Unacceptable

- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment three times a week (the establishment was operating five days a week) and the duration of visits was one hour.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; there was not a HACCP plan for each product where a hazard had been identified; and the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAI	ME	CITY Langhirano	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	11/01	Est. 586-L F. Lli Galloni SPA		COUNTRY ITALY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL & Dr. Allodi	1	EVALUATION X Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unac	ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each	review	item listed	l below)	i	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	
A = Acceptable M = Margi	nally Acc		U = Unacceptable	28	Formulations	55
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross	contamination prevention			A 56
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 ()
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	67 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64 O	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	l identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	114	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Huma	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant	t 70
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	n 71
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	emned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONT	rol
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPM	IENT	Restri	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Retur	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Resid	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A		oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78
Welfare facilities	23 O	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HAND		1	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 .A	Bone	less meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A		dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 C	Cont	rol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY Langhirano
	12/11/01	Est. 586-L F. Lli Galloni SPA	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Pierantoni		ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 31. Product that contacted the floor (drop meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. Inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting the establishment two times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and the duration of visits was two hours.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the flow diagram was not completed or did not include all process steps and product flow; the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	REVIE	W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAW			Mazzo Di Vina	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	-20-01	Est. I-632-L Rigamonti Sacur	iificio :	SPA COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		e of fore ilippo C	IGN OFFICIAL astoldi			Ceptable/	Ceptáble
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r							<u> </u>
A = Acceptable M = Margin	ally Ac	ceptable	U = Unacceptable	, — · · ·	Not Reviewed	O = Does not a	,
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	ials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confid	mation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	OZ A	Product	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ms	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	м	Inspector monito	ring	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	dules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing recor	ds	63 O
Pest control program	oe M	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	05 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedure	s	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure	e exam	66 O
Lighting	114	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim containe	r handling	67 O
Operations work space	12	Antem	ortem dispositions	39	Post-processing	handling	68
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation proce	dures	69 O
Ventilation	14	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	10	Process. defect	actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	1	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing conti	rol inspection	71
Equipment approval	160	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE	CON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	ντ	Restric	cted product control	40	Export product i	dentification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	174	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verific	ation	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	es	74 A
Product contact equipment	12	Resido	e program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	470	Inspection super	vision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of secur	ity items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securi	ty	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verificat	tion	0
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" statu	IS	90 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	iG .	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports		81
Personal dress and habits	25 M		ess meat reinspection	52 O			T
Personal hygiene practices	**	Ingred	dients identification	53 A			T
Sanitary dressing procedures	"0	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-20-01	Est. I-632-L Rigamonti Sacunificio	SPA	Mazzo Di Vina COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Filippo Ca		EVALUATION X Acceptable Re-	peptable/ Unacceptable		
COMMENTS:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
8 Insectocutors were observed over the different areas of the establishment	e product in the	final product processing and storage a	ireas. Establishment	will install them in		
25 The street cloth of the company empessablishment personnel.	ployee was not o	completely covered by his working clo	oth. This deficiency	was corrected by the		
34,35 Inspector was performing pre-op	erational and o	perational sanitation once a week.				
43 The inedible product was not denate	ured in this esta	blishment.				
76 The FSIS auditor could find little clevels of supervision by the central measurement actions in the event that the	at inspection aut	hority. It was not clear who would be	responsible for the			
. •						

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	1E	CITY Dosolo (MN)		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	10/01	Est. 643 M/S F. LLi Martelli S.P.A		COUNTRY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry			IGN OFFICIAL Castoldi & Dr. Festa A. Cell	1	EVALUATION Acceptable Re-review Unacc	eptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	ррІу	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	^	Packaging materials	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 O	
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	ı	Inspector monitoring	60 O	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62 O	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing records	() 63	
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 A	Container closure exam		
Lighting	11 M	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 A	Interim container handling	67 ()	
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O	
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions plant	70 0	
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	71 A	
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTE	SOL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73	
Over-product equipment	18 A	-	3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74	
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	78	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	17	
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-be	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP	83	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A		dients identification	53 O			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/10/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 643 M/S F. LLi Martelli S.P.A	COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Noe; Dr.	IGN OFFICIAL Castoldi & Dr. Festa A. Cell	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 11. Light at the hog viscera inspection station was inadequate and was not shadow proof. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 30. Dirty legs of rack for edible product was contacting edible product that stacked on top of each other. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	***	San Daniel					
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-	10-Ó1	Est. 649-L Prosciuttificio Mo	COUNTRY ITALY			
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL			ceptable/	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r A = Acceptable M = Margina			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not ap	ρρίγ
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 M	Formulations		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	als	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confir	mation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Product	reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 O	Product	transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ns	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monito	ring	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	ules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	onal sanitation	35 M	Processing record	ds	63 O
Pest control program	08 M	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	PQ A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure	exam	66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container	handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing I	handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Human	e Slaughter	40	Incubation proced	dures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmo	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant 7		
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control - inspection		
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/E	CON. FRAUD CONTRO	ж
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMEN	π	Restric	ted product control	44 A	Export product id	lentification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	ntion	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	es	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	e program compliance	46 O	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47	Inspection super	vision	7%
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	e reporting procedures	48 O	Control of securi	ty items	777 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Аррго	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securit	Υ	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verificati	ion	79
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	3	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN		1	oning trim	51 A	Imports		61
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1	lients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-10-01	Est. 649-L Prosciuttificio Morganto	S.P.A.	COUNTR ITALY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Visentini	IGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION Acceptable X Re	ceptable/ review	Unacceptable	
COMMENTS:						
8 Insectocuters located over the expose scheduled for correction by the establish	•	observed in several rooms through the	e establishment. Th	is deficiei	ncy was	
19 Several deep cuts were observed in	the conveyor be	It at the receiving area. This was sch	eduled for correction	ı by the es	stablishment.	
19/34 Several ham hangers were observas directed for correction by the estab			ter the washing in th	e salting r	room. This	
28 The employee trimming the edible pwith edible product on the conveyor be he still not washed his hands.						
34, 35 The SSOP pre-operative correct describing the SSOP deficiencies. The operational sanitation once or twice a vertical sanitation once or twice a vertical sanitation once or twice as vertical sanitation on the sanitation of the sanitation on the sanitation of the sa	government ins		-	•		
43 Inedible container was not identified was identified as inedible and was instrincorrect and it will be changed by the	ructed to be san	_	-		•	
43 Metal inedible container was not in establishment. The first deficiency was Italian inspection officials in Rome.					-	
76a The FSIS auditor could find little of levels of supervision by the central me corrective actions in the event that the	at inspection au	thority. It was not clear who would b	e responsible for the		•	
76b Internal reviews were performed	only four times	per year.				
82. The establishment's HACCP prograpplicable regulatory requirements for critical limits were exceeded. The ma	implementation	1. The plan did not describe what wou		• •		

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	11000	_				San Daniele	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		11-01	Est. 683-L Friuli Venezia G	iulia Ce	sare Fiorucci SPA	COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL liz		ceptable/ review Unacc	Cepta	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = Acceptable$ $M = Margin$			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not a	pply
1 CONTAMINATION CONTROL	Cross contamination prevention 28 A Formulations					55	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materi	als	56
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confir	mation	57
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label clair	ns	59
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	AM	Inspector monito	ring	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing sched	lules	61
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equip	ment	62
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing record	ds	63
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	Waste disposal 36 Empty can inspect				64
Pest control monitoring	Q9 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures		65	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification 37 Container closu				e exam	66
Lighting	II.	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container	handling	67
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 39 Post-process			handling	68
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation proce	dures	69
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41	Process. defect a	ictions – plant	70
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42	Processing contr	ol inspection	71
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/E	CON. FRAUD CONTRO	OC
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMEN	π	Restric	cted product control	14A	Export product ic	lentification	72
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verifica	ition	7.
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate	es .	7.
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	e program compliance	46 O	Single standard		7
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	470	Inspection super	vision	7
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of securi	ty items	7
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment securit	Y	7
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verificate	ion	7
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	•	-
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	ıG	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports		1
Personal dress and habits	25 M	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР		8
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	1 -	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

				San Danier
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-11-01	Est. 683-L Friuli Venezia Giulia Ce	sare Fiorucci SPA	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Ivonne Ca		EVALUATION X Acceptable Re-	ceptable/ review Unacceptable
COMMENTS:				
•				
25 The establishment employye street of	cloth was not co	mpletely covered with his working clo	oth in the salting roo	m. This deficiency
was corrected immediately by the establ			·	·
30 Several hams were observed to cont	act the wall and	protecting metal covering for the air	circulation in the dry	ing room. This was
corrected immediately by the establishm				ing room. This was
30 Several strings for hanging hams or	the conveyor t	elt were observed to contact the inedit	nle container in the s	alting room. This
deficiency was corrected immediately b			ne container in the s	aning room. This
34, 35 The government inspector was The SSOP records did not include the p				
43 The inedible product was not denat	ered in this esta	blishment.		
76a The FSIS auditor could find little of		_		
levels of supervision by the central me corrective actions in the event that the	_		-	implementation of
76b Internal reviews were performed	only three to fo	ır times per year.	,	
82. The establishment's HACCP prograpplicable regulatory requirements for		•	(s) did not address ad	dequately the

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	26-01	Est. 688-L Fontane del Duca S.R.L.				COUNTRY		
	41444	05.5005	1000 05510101		FMALLIA TION		taly		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		Cesare Al	IGN OFFICIAL lodi		EVALUATION Acceptable	Accep Re-rev		Unacc	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r A = Acceptable M = Margini			U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	d () = D	oes not ap	nolv
1 CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulation				55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials				56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation			57 A	
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label appro	vals			58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special labe	l claim:	s		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector m	onitori	ng		60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing :	schedu	les		61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing	equipm	ent	·	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing	records			63 O
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can i	inspect	ion	 -	640
Pest control monitoring	PO A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures				65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam				66 O
Lighting	117	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling			ng	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-proces	sing ha	andling	9	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar			Incubation procedures			69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. de	fect ac	tions	plant	70
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 0	Processing	control	- ins	pection	710
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U				or 	
(LA) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMEN		Restric	cted product control	44 _A	Export prod	luct ide	ntifica	ation	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector v	erificat	ion		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certi	ificates			74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Residu	e program compliance	46	Single stand	dard			75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	 	ing procedures	170	Inspection	supervi	sion		7%
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of	security	/ item:	s	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 0	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment s	ecurity			78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	SO A	Species ver	rificatio	n		79
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to"	status			80 _A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	IG	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 O	Imports				81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		<u> </u>		82 1
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	,	dients identification	53 A			····		T
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	s4 0					

HEALEM DATE | ESTABOSHIMENT INO. WAS INVINE

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Sala Baganza

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-26-01	Est. 688-L Fontane del Duca S.R.I.	·.	COUNTRY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare Al			ceptable/ review Unacceptable
COMMENTS:				

- 7 Insectocutor observed over the product in several areas on the establishment. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.
- 19 Several plastic trays were observed to be broken and metal racks were observed with pieces of fat. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment.
- 34. 35 The SSOP pre-operational sanitation preventive action was missing and deficiencies were not clearly identified. The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once in two months and operational sanitation once a week for one hour.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		- 440.4	F 7141 1 6 D 4			D
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		14/01	Est. 714-L Levoni S.P.A.		COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Olo Urban	Dr. C	esare Al		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable	ceptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r A = Acceptable M = Margina			U = Unacceptable.	N =	= Not Reviewed 0 = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	28 M	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	Product handling and storage 30 A La		Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	-	Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	Antemortem dispositions 35		Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	40	Process. defect actions - plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42	Processing control inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTRO)r
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restri	cted product control	44 _A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 M	Reside	ue program compliance	46	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	47	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	45	Control of security items	777 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE		1	oning trim	S1 A	Imports	81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A		ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Cont	rol of restricted ingredients	54 0		
			MAY MANAGER AND BE LISED LIMITE CYCLAUSTED	n .		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/14/01	Est. 714-L Levoni S.P.A.	COUNTRY Italy	0
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare Al		ceptable/ review U	nacceptable

- 19 Dirty racks were observed in the fatting room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment employee.
- 28 Small pieces of stones were found on the product in the salting room. This was corrected by the establishment.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month and operational sanitation once a week.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured by this establishment.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NA	ME	San Daniele D F	riuli
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12/	04/01	Est. 720-L A E B Prosciutti SPA		COUNTRY	
AME OF REVIEWER Or. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME Dr. C		IGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable Unacceptable ptable	
ODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not ap	ply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Nater potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	O2 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	RAM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	O8 A	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64 O	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL	Filling procedures	65 O	
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38	Interim container handling	67 ()
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 O	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTR	OL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME	NT	Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ned and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	470	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 ()
Outside premises	24 A	1	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	NG	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A		81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingred	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12/04/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 720-L A E B Prosciutti SPA	CITY San Daniele D Friuli COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Caliz	IGN OFFICIAL	ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 31. Product that contacted the floor (drop meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with adequate light. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 34, 35. GOI meat inspection officials were not adequately monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. The daily pre-operational sanitation monitoring was performed one to two times a month.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- B. The supervisory visits that were performed were not done monthly. Only four visits were conducted per year by the local district/provincial officials.
- C. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing adequate daily inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment one to two times a week (the establishment operates five days per week) and the duration of visits was between one to two hours.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	22-01	Est. 744-L Parmacotto S.P.	.Α.		COUNT	RY	
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME	OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION	Italy		
Dr. Oto Urban		loe & Pic			Acceptable 2	Acceptable/ Re-review	Unacco	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r $A = Acceptable \qquad M = Margina$			U = Unacceptable	N	= Not Reviewed	O = 0	oes not ap	oply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	Cross contamination prevention 28 M			Formulations		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	Equipment Sanitizing		Packaging materials			56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation			57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approv	als		58 M
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label	claims		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROG	RAM	Inspector mo	nitoring		60
Sanitizers	05 M	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing s	chedules		61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 U	Processing e	quipment		62 O
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing re	ecords		63 O
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can in	spection		64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 M		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures			65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 O				66 O
Lighting	11,	Antem	ortem inspec, procedures	38 O	Interim container handling		ng	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39	Post-processing handling			68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures			69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions pla		plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing c	ontrol - ins	pection	70
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIA	NÇE/ECON. FRA	UD CONTRO	ж
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMEN	ιτ	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export produ	ct identifica	ation	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector ve	rification		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certif	icates		74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	e program compliance	46	Single stand	ard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	170	Inspection so	upervision		7€
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resido	e reporting procedures	46	Control of se	ecurity item:	s	77 _A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	Approval of chemicals, etc.		Shipment security			78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storag	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species veri	fication		79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" s	tatus		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	G	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports			81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР			82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingred	dients identification	53 A				83
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A				

HEVIEW DATE | ESTABLISHMENT NO. MIND TIME

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Sala Baganza

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	44.00.01	For 744 I. Do C.D.A		1	عدد عدد	zgaru	La		
(reverse)	11-22-01	Est. 744-L Parmacotto S.P.A.			COUNT	RY			
					Italy				
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Noe & Pie		EVALUATION Acceptable	Acc	ceptable/ review		Unacceptable		
COMMENTS:	I		·						
5 The sanitizer in the receiving room of	lid not have end	ugh water. This was corrected immed	diately by the	establi	shment (offic	ialc		
The same in the receiving reem		-6.		0012011	oration (orric.	1013,		
7 Spider webs were observed in the re-	7 Spider webs were observed in the receiving cooler. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment officials.								
7/9 There was a space under the door st	ifficient for rod	ent to get in to the shipping room. Th	ne frequency	of rode	of contro	al ne	rformed		
by the contracted company was not suff						•			
by the contracted company was not sure	iciciii (cver) see	some monary. This was beneated for	correction by	are est	ZONSIUN	Citt U	miciais.		
28 The plastic felt down on the floor	was nicked up h	v an employee who did not change his	s gloves and c	ontinuz	to worl	k in 1	the		
molding room. The company scheduled	•		Bro . oo ama c		, to trott		aic .		
molding room. The company schodule	s the training of	ule employee.							
30 Oil spots were found on the ham in	two cases in the	receiving cooler. This was corrected	1 immediately	hy the	ectablici	hmai	n f		
•	(wo cases in un	receiving cooler. This was corrected	a minimonatory	by the	CSCAULISI	mici	.α		
employee.									
34, 35 Several dirty equipment (metal	hine) with niece	es of meat and fat observed in the mas	caging room	Thic d	eficienci		c found		
despite of a report of the proper task ac	•		_		•	•			
•	-				-		a. This		
deficiency requires employee training,			unem inspec	or was	periorm	ung			
pre-operational and operational sanitati	on twice or uire	e times a week for two mours.							
40 mm		al		m.:					
43 There was no identification of ined			ig of nams.	inis wa	s scheau	ilea I	or		
correction by the company employees.	I ne condemne	a product is not denatured in Italy.							
50 T	45 - 1-5 - 1 - 6 T		l ara from Ital	7 %	:_:	. c _·			
58 There is an incorrect statement on			are from Ital	y. Inc	origin o	or big	gs is from		
Denmark. The establishment schedule	a unis deficiency	for correction.							
76. The FSIS auditor could find little		_					U		
levels of supervision by the central me	-	· ·	•	for the	impleme	entat	ion of		
corrective actions in the event that the	official veterin	arian's performance did not meet requ	irements.						
82. The establishment's HACCP prog		•	• •			•			
applicable regulatory requirements for	_				exceede	ow be	ere not		
sufficiently described and clarification	was needed reg	arding the intended consumers of the	finished produ	ict.					

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS			m . gco.t. t Linner Day		Langhirano		
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	29-01	Est. 758-L Langhiranese Pros	COUNTRY Italy			
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE Allodi &	IGN OFFICIAL Stefano	EVALUATION Acceptable X Acceptable/ Re-review Unit	•Coeptable		
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each of A = Acceptable M = Margin			U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed 0 = Does not	apply	
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention 28 A		3 1	Formulations		
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing		29 A	Packaging materials	56 A	
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 M	Laboratory confirmation	57 A	
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A	
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label claims	59 O	
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	um.	Inspector monitoring	60	
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O	
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment	62 O	
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records	63 O	
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64	
Pest control monitoring	09 M		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure exam		
Lighting	11 M	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling		
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O	
Inspector work space	13 A	Human	ne Slaughter	40	Incubation procedures		
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions - plant		
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control - inspection	1 70	
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONT	ROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME		1	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A	
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A	
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19 M	Resido	e program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A	
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ling procedures	470	Inspection supervision	76	
Dry storage areas	21 A	Reside	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A	
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A	
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 O	
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80 A	
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN	4G	Pre-b	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81 O	
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	НАССР	82 M	
Personal hygiene practices	26 A		dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Conti	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O		T	
		4.0630.3.444	TO MARCH MAY BE INCO INTHE CYLLICTY	n			

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Langhirano

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11-29-01	Est. 758-L Langhiranese Prosciutti	COUNTRY Italy	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	Drs. Allodi &			ceptable/ Unaccept
COMMENTS:				

- 4 Paper towel was found to continuously contacting piece of equipment. This deficiency was corrected immediately.
- 9 Insectocuters were observed over the product in several areas in the establishment. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment.
- 11 Inspection table and sufficient light were missing in the meat receiving room. This was scheduled for correction.
- 17 Flaking paint close to the product but not over it was observed in the salting room and drying room. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment management.
- 19/34 Plastic plates used for ham salting were not clean before the start of operation in the salting room. There was no immediate corrective action by the establishment or inspection service.
- 19/34 The conveyor belt was found with pieces of dry meat before operation in the receiving room. No corrective action performe either by the company or inspection service.
- 19/35 Clean and dirty plastic plates were not separated after the washing. No corrective action by the establishment or the inspectio service were observed.
- 30 Product (remains of hams) were observed on the wall in the drying room. No corrective action by the establishment was perfor during the audit.
- 34/35 The preoperational and operational sanitation deficiencies observed were not reported in the SSOP documents. This is going be corrected by the establishment. The SSOP preventive action was not performed and deficiencies observed during the audit were recorded in the SSOP records. The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once a month and operational sanitation once a week.
- 43 Inedible barrels were used for storing edible product in the salting room. The corrective action observed was removal of inedible mark from the barrel by the consortium representative. The new edible container contained inedible product and equipment that ha not been washed The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to highe levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation. A portion of the corrective action was misplaced under monitoring activit and CCPs were not defined by number.

	105,45	44 D A TE	COTADUICUMENT NO. AND MA	45	CITY	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	VIE	CITY Migliarina Di C	arpi
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM		26/01	Est. 791 M/S Italcarni Soc. Coop. A.R.L.		COUNTRY	
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME Dr. P	OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL , Dr. Noe, & Dr. Emore Vezz	ani	EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable	:eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = Acceptable$ $M = Margi$			l below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 ()
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	t handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 M	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGR	MA	Inspector monitoring	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operat	ional sanitation	35 A	Processing records	63 63
Pest control program	08 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal	identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 M	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 A	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control inspection	⁷¹ 0
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONTR	4OL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPM	ENT	Restric	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residu	ue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 C
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTRO		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDL		1	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A		dients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)		ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	 CITY Migliarina Di Carpi
	11/26/01	Est. 791 M/S Italcami Soc. Coop. A.R.L.	COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faizur R. Choudry	NAME OF FORE Dr. Pierantoni	ign official , Dr. Noe, & Dr. Emore Vezzani	ceptable/ -review Unacceptable

- 07. Gaps at the bottoms of door in the deboning room and casing room were not sealed properly to prevent the entry of rodents and other vermin. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 11. Light at the hog head inspection station was inadequate and was not shadow proof. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 31. Product that contacted the floor (drop meat) was not reconditioned in a sanitary manner before being added to the edible product and facility for reconditioning drop meat was inadequate such as designated area with light, hand-washing, and sanitizing facility. Establishment officials ordered correction immediately.
- 43. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized or under security before shipping for rendering.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective action in the even that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; and the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		W DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAM	1E	CITY Paliano (PR)	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11/	16/01	Est. 989-L Corte Buona S.P.A.	COUNTRY ITALY		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Faiz Choudry & Dr. Oto Urban			IGN OFFICIAL eri, IIC & Dr. Pietro Noe		EVALUATION Acceptable Acceptable/ Re-review X Unac	ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed O = Does not a	apply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross c	ontamination prevention	28 M	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipm	ent Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 O
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	AM	Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	o5 U	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 U	Processing equipment	62 A
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 U	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 M	Waste	disposal	Empty can inspection	64 () 65 ()	
Pest control monitoring	09 A		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures	
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 ()	Interim container handling	67
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humar	ne Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Conde	mned product control	43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONT	ROL
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPME		Restric	cted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 U	Return	ed and rework product	45 N	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 M		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 U	Residu	ie program compliance	46 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampl	ing procedures	470	Inspection supervision	76
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	ue reporting procedures	48 O	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 1
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status	80
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIF	vg.	Pre-bo	oning trim	51 A	Imports	81
Personal dress and habits	25 A		ess meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР	82 U
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingre	dients identification	53 A		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Contr	ol of restricted ingredients	54 A		\top

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	11/16/01	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME Est. 989-L Corte Buona S.P.A.		CITY Paliano (PR) COUNTRY ITALY
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FORE		EVALUATION	IIALI
Dr. Faiz Choudry & Dr. Oto Urban	Dr. Maestripie	eri, IIC & Dr. Pietro Noe		review X Unacceptable

- 05. Sanitizer was not working during the operation in the processing room. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 07. Door was not effectively shut in the product receiving room and cover over the vent was broken in the smoking room. Flies were observed in the processing and packaging rooms. Establishment officials ordered correction.
- 17 A. Dripping condensate, from overhead refrigeration units that were not cleaned/sanitized dialy, was falling in one cooler. There was no product underneath at the time of audit. B. Dripping condensate, from ceilings that were not cleaned/sanitized daily, was falling onto hams in the cooking and smoking rooms and also ceilings were observed with mildew. Neither establishment nor GOI meat inspection officials took corrective action. This is a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 18. Overhead ceilings in the processing room were observed with accumulation of pieces of fat, meat, and dirt.
- 19, 28. In the processing rooms: containers for edible product were found with grease, fat, and broken; conveyor belt for edible product, brine injection equipment, working tables, and molds for ham were found with fat and pieces of meat from previous days' operation. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 26. Several employees were not observing good hygienic work habits to prevent product contamination such as: plastic packaging material was contacting floor during packaging; cartons were kept on the floor and dirty steel was kept on the working table.
- 34. 35 A. The daily pre-operational and operational sanitation monitoring deficiencies were not identified and any corrective actions taken were not documented by the establishment personnel and SSOP records did not reflect the actual sanitary conditions observed in the establishment. B. GOI meat inspection officials were not monitoring/verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the pre-operational and operational sanitation SSOP. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 43 A. Edible and inedible product containers were not identified to prevent possible cross-contamination and/or cross utilization. B. Inedible product was not denatured/decharacterized before leaving establishment. This was a repeat deficiency from the last audit.
- 76 A. The FSIS auditors could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements. B. GOI meat inspection officials were not providing daily adequate inspection coverage. Inspector was visiting establishment three times a week (the establishment was working five days per week) and the duration of visits was one hour.
- 79. Species verification testing was not carried out as required by FSIS.
- 80. Because of gross product contamination and lack of compliance with daily pre-operational and operational sanitation/equivalent sanitation programs and procedures, inadequate inspectional controls, and noncompliance with basic FSIS regulatory requirements of HACCP program, the status of this establishment is not equivalent to that required in the U.S. program. All the above deficiencies were discussed with Dr. Maestripieri, IIC, and Dr. Pietro Noe and they agreed to remove Establishment 989-L from the list of establishments eligible to export meat and meat products to the United States, effective November 16, 2001.
- 82. This establishment did <u>not</u> meet some the the FSIS basic regulatory requirements of the HACCP program. In addition, the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation: the hazard analysis had not been conducted or was not complete; the intended use of the product or end used had not been identified; there was not a HACCP plan for each product where a hazard had been identified; all hazards identified were not addressed by a CCP; there was not a critical limit and/or monitoring frequency for each CCP; there was no description of corrective action to be taken when a critical limit was exceeded; the HACCP plan had not been validated using multiple monitoring results; the HACCP plan did not list the procedures to verify effective implementation and/or frequency of these procedures; there were no records produced for monitoring of the HACCP plan CCPs, or the records did not show actual values and observations; and (12) pre-shipment document reviews were not being conducted by establishment officials.

NOTE: This establishment was unacceptable during the last audit in May, 2001.

NOTE: The deficiencies listed above were not identified by either establishment or inspection personnel. Corrective action was not initiated until the need was identified by the FSIS auditor.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-	2-12-01 ESt. 1170-L Brendolan Service SKL			COUNTRY Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		NE OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Ivonne Caliz EVALUATION Acceptable				eptable/ Unac	ceptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each r A = Acceptable M = Margin			d below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not a	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross o	contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations		55 O
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing 29		1 1	Packaging materials		56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Produc	Product handling and storage 30 Laboratory con			nation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 O	Produc	t reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals		58 M
Back siphonage prevention	03 O	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label claims		
Hand washing facilities	04 M	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monitor	ing	60
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules		er O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipr	nent	62 O
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records		63 0
Pest control program	80 A	Waste	disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	eo A	2. DISEASE CONTROL			Filling procedures		65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	l identification	37 O	Container closure	exam	66 O
Lighting	11 _A	Antem	ortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container	handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antem	ortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling		68 O
Inspector work space	13 A			Incubation proced	lures	69 O	
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions - pla		70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control inspection		71 O
Equipment approval	16	Condemned product control 43 5. COMPLIANCE/ECO		CON. FRAUD CONTROL			
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restri	cted product control	44 A	Export product identification		72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 _A	Return	ned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	tion	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A		3. RESIDUE CONTROL		Export certificate:	<u> </u>	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Reside	ue program compliance	46	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 _A	Samp	ling procedures	47			7€ _U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Resid	ue reporting procedures	48	Control of securit	y items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	oval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	1	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	on	79 O
Outside premises	24 A	1	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLIN		1	oning trim	51 O	Imports		81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	less meat reinspection	52 O	НАССР		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 O		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Conti	rol of restricted ingredients	54 O			

PITERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	12-12-01	Est. 1170-L Brendolan Service SR	L	COUNTRY Italy
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FORE Dr. Ivonne Ca			ceptable/ review Unacceptable

- 4 The flipping top on waste receptacles was observed at the hand washing facilities across the establishment. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation once in 14 days and operational sanitation once a week. The SSOP corrective action was not specific enough and the preventive action needs to be included. This was scheduled for correction by the establishment management.
- 43 The edible plastic container was observed to be set on the floor in the slicing room. This deficiency was corrected immediately by the establishment management. The inedible product was not denatured in this establishment.
- 58 The establishment label approval indicates the European Union number not the one approved for the U.S.A. This was scheduled to be corrected by the establishment management.

76a The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.

- 76b Internal reviews were performed only four times per year.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS					_	Lesignanobagni	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	11-	1-28-01 Est. 1217 Stagionatura Prosciutti Torione				COUNTRY Italy	
IAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi EVALUATION X Acceptable					ceptable/ / Unacc	eptable
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each of A = Acceptable M = Margin			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not ap	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL	Cross contamination prevention A			Formulations		55 A	
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing 29			Packaging materials		5G A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage			Laboratory confir	mation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning			Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	t transportation	32 N	Special label claims		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM			Inspector monitoring		
Sanitizers	05 A	Effecti	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules		
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment		
Pestno evidence	07 M	Operational sanitation			Processing records		
Pest control program	80 A	Waste disposal			Empty can inspection		
Pest control monitoring	09 M		2. DISEASE CONTROL		Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Anima	identification	37 O	Container closure	exam	66 O
Lighting	11,	Antemortem inspec. procedures			Interim container	handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions			Post-processing I	nandling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter			Incubation proced	dures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postm	ortem inspec. procedures	410	Process. defect actions plant		70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions 42 Pro		Processing contro	ol - inspection	71 O	
Equipment approval	16 O	Condemned product control		43 U	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON, FRAUD CONTRO)L
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control			Export product id	lentification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 M	Return	Returned and rework product		Inspector verification		73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A			Export certificate	:s	74 A	
Product contact equipment	19	Resido	e program compliance	46	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Samp	ing procedures	470	Inspection supervision		76 _U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Reside	ue reporting procedures	48	Control of security items		777 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Appro	val of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security		78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Stora	ge and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification		79 O
Outside premises	24 A		4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL		"Equal to" status		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLE	(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		oning trim	51 A	Imports		O A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 O	HACCP		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingre	dients identification	53 A			
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 O	Control of restricted ingredients					

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

11-28-01	Est. 1217 Stagionatura Pi	rosciutti Torione	COUNTRY Italy	
			Acceptable/ Re-review Unacceptable	
		·		
the product traffi	c areas in the receiving, dry	ing and shipping rooms. Thi	s was scheduled for	
	NAME OF FORD	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Cesare Allodi	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL Dr. Corare Allodi	

- correction by the establishment.
- 17 The ceiling over the product was crumbling in two places in the drying room. Product was moved away from the affected area and this deficiency was scheduled for correction by the establishment officials.
- 34, 35 The government inspector was performing pre-operational sanitation twice a year and operational sanitation twice a week for the duration of the visit of one to two hours. The pre-operational preventive action was missing.
- 43 The inedible product was not denatured at this establishment.
- 76. The FSIS auditor could find little evidence that the official veterinarian in charge of the establishment was accountable to higher levels of supervision by the central meat inspection authority. It was not clear who would be responsible for the implementation of corrective actions in the event that the official veterinarian's performance did not meet requirements.
- 82. The establishment's HACCP program met the basic requirements, but the HACCP plan(s) did not address adequately the applicable regulatory requirements for implementation.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		00.01	E. 1000 F. Berniewickie M	0774	AU C D A	reuno	
FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-	12-03-01 Est. 1223-L Prosciuttificio MOZ			Italy		
NAME OF REVIEWER Dr. Oto Urban		OF FORE	IGN OFFICIAL Iodi	EVALUATION X Acceptable R	Acceptable/ Unacc	peptable/ Unacceptable	
CODES (Give an appropriate code for each $A = Acceptable$ $M = Margin$			below) U = Unacceptable	N =	Not Reviewed	O = Does not as	pply
1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL			Cross contamination prevention 28 A		Formulations		55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES	Equipment Sanitizing			Packaging materials			
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage			Laboratory conf	irmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning			Label approvals		58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Produc	Product transportation		Special label claims		59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) E	STABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRA	M	Inspector monitoring 60		
Sanitizers	05 M	Effectiv	ve maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules 6		
Establishments separation	06 A	Preope	rational sanitation	34 M	Processing equipment 6		
Pestno evidence	07 A	Operat	ional sanitation	35 M	Processing records		
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal			Empty can inspection 64		
Pest control monitoring	09 A	2. DISEASE CONTROL			Filling procedures		
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification			Container closu	re exam	65 O
Lighting	11 _A	Antemortem inspec. procedures			Interim containe	er handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions			Post-processing	handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter			Incubation proc	edures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures		410	Process. defect	actions - plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postm	ortem dispositions	Processing control - inspec		trol inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 O	Conde	mned product control	43 U			OL.
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restric	ted product control	44 A	Export product identification		
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Return	ed and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification		73 A
Over-product equipment	16 A	a accious courror E		Export certificates		74 A	
Product contact equipment	12	Residue program compliance		46	Single standard		75 A
Other product areas (inside)	70 _A	Sampl	Sampling procedures		Inspection supervision		76 U
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residu	Residue reporting procedures		Control of security items		77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 O	Approval of chemicals, etc.		49 A	Shipment security		78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals		50 A	Species verification		79 O
Outside premises	24 A	4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL			"Equal to" status		80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Fre-bound fum		51 A			81 O
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Bonel	ess meat reinspection	52 A	HACCP .		82 M
Personal hygiene practices	26 M	Ingred	lients identification	53 A 54 O			
Sanitary dressing procedures	"o	Control of restricted ingredients					

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Felino

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM	12-03-01	Est. 1223-L Prosciuttificio MOZZ	COUNTRY						
(reverse)				Italy					
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FORE Dr. Cesare Al	EIGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION	ceptable/					
Dr. Oto Urban	Dr. Cesale A			review Unacceptable					
COMMENTS:									
5 The water temperature in both saniti	izers was below	the required temperature of 82C in the	ic deboning room T	his deficiency was					
corrected immediately by the establishin				ms deticioney was					
corrected immediately by the comment									
26 The box with strings destined to be	used for the ed	ible product were stored on the floor.	This deficiency was	corrected					
immediately by the establishment mana	igement.		·						
34, 35 The government inspector was	performing pre-	-operational sanitation twice a year an	d operational sanitati	on once a week.					
43 The inedible product was not denat	tured in this esta	iblishment.							
76. The FSIS auditor could find little e		_		•					
levels of supervision by the central mea	-		-	implementation of					
corrective actions in the event that the	official veterina	arian's performance did not meet requ	irements.						
82. The establishment's HACCP prog	ram met the has	ic requirements, but the HACCP plan	(s) did not address a	dequately the					
applicable regulatory requirements for		•	(3) did not address at	sequatory are					
appricable regulatory requirements for implementation.									

Country Response Not Received